DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 159 110 95 SO 011 124

TITLE State Need Statements and Educational Objectives in Citizen Education: Final Report.
INSTITUTION Research for Better Schools, Inc., Philadelphia, Pa.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 31 May 78
NOTE 117p.; For related documents, see SO 011 125-130; Appendix I may not reproduce clearly in hard copy due to small type size of original document

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$6.01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Adult Education; Citizen Role; *Citizenship; Citizenship Responsibility; *Civics; Decision Making; Educational Environment; Educational Improvement; Educational Legislation; Educational Needs; *Educational Objectives; Educational Planning; Educational Policy; Educational Research; *Educational Responsibility; Elementary Secondary Education; Evaluation Criteria; Government Role; Knowledge Level; *Needs Assessment; Social Responsibility; Social Studies; State of the Art Reviews; *State Surveys; Summative Evaluation
IDENTIFIERS *Citizenship Education; Delaware; New Jersey; Pennsylvania

ABSTRACT

The report presents an overview of perspectives on citizen education; relates needs expressed by planning groups for citizen education programs in Deleware, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania; and presents materials relating to national and state citizenship education priorities. A major purpose of the document is to help state and local educators and curriculum planners develop citizenship education programs. The first section stresses the resurgent interest in education for citizenship across the United States. The second section documents planning and research activities carried out in 1978 between Research for Better Schools, Inc. (RBS) and planning groups in Delaware, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania. Activities included dialogue between RBS and state departments of education, workshops to develop goals for citizen education, statewide conferences of educators, and committee research on educational legislation relating to citizenship education. The third section presents reports on citizenship education from local, state, and national organizations; proceedings from citizen education conferences in Pennsylvania and New Jersey, and an outline of citizen education priorities in Delaware. (Author/DB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED159110

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

STATE NEED STATEMENTS AND EDUCATIONAL OBJECTIVES IN CITIZEN EDUCATION: FINAL REPORT *

Submitted to

National Institute of Education

by

Research for Better Schools, Inc.
Suite 1700/1700 Market Street
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103

SO 011 124

May 31, 1978

* To be read in conjunction with STATE CITIZEN EDUCATION PLANNING GROUPS: FINAL REPORT

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
The National Perspective on Citizen Education		1
Tri-state Needs and Goals in Citizen Education		4
Summary		6
References		8
Appendix 1:	Report of the Committee on Citizenship Education, Council of Chief State School Officers (1976)	9
Appendix 2:	Position Statement of the Pennsylvania Council for the Social Studies	13
Appendix 3:	National Assessment of Educational Progress Bulletin	15
Appendix 4:	Proceedings of Citizen Education Conference, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania	19
Appendix 5:	Proceedings of the New Jersey Citizen Education Conference	66
Appendix 6:	Citizen Education Priority in the State of Delaware	112

STATE NEED STATEMENTS AND EDUCATIONAL OBJECTIVES IN CITIZEN EDUCATION: FINAL REPORT

As part of its conceptualization and planning effort, the Citizen Education component of Research for Better Schools, Inc. (RBS) has worked with each state in its region (Delaware, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania) to help develop a need statement regarding citizen education for that state and to set citizen education-related objectives for the state within the context of the current school improvement program.

The purpose of this report is to document the events of the past six months which have been cooperatively pursued by RBS and the three states in its region as the need statements and objectives have been developed. The report includes sections on the national perspective on citizen education and tri-state needs and goals in citizen education. A summary of the status of the relationship between Research for Better Schools and the three states concludes the report. Several appendices follow the report and provide documents that elaborate on the events described.

The National Perspective on Citizen Education

Recent literature reveals a resurgent interest in education for citizenship across the United States. Butts calls citizen education "the oldest newest innovation in the schools" (Butts, 1977), and reviews the concerns and arguments with which educators must deal in determining a focus for citizenship education into the 1980's. The federal government

as well as several private foundations, have sponsored conferences and meetings across the country to determine the needs of and to recommend the resolutions for responsible citizenship. A National Task Force on Citizenship Education has been working in Washington to chart what is happening nationally and to advise the administration on the soundest approaches to correcting the difficulties of a post-Watergate and post-Vietnam America.

Translating goals for the nation into directives for local educators is a concern of many groups: legislatures, state education agencies, and professional organizations. Such translation in citizen education has been a recent concern of the Council of Chief State School Officers which established a Committee on Citizenship Education in 1976. (See Appendix 1.) The Committee's report underlines the national need for activity in this area and sites decline of citizen action as one of the pressing national problems, as well as increased violence and crime. Further, the Committee calls for an expanded concept of citizenship to serve the nation's global role, as well as to redefine the citizen's position in the complexities of modern society. The committee's report includes suggestions for state and local authorities to carry out activities that can improve the national situation. Private organizations such as the American Bar Association and commercial publishers are alerted to join the effort.

Professional educational organizations have stressed citizen education activities in local sites, too. The National Council for the

Social Studies devoted much of their 1978 annual meeting to citizen education and published several books on the topic. State councils across the country issued position statements that reinforced the National Council (see Appendix 2) policy and advocated a program for the total school environment and for community involvement, as well. Other national groups, such as the Association for Curriculum Development and the Moral Education Association, have raised citizenship concerns in topics such as equity education and values formation, and have pursued these interests in their national and regional conferences.

The work of the National Assessment of Educational Progress has periodically provided assessment data on citizenship behavior. Every three years, their results on testing 13-and 17-year olds on various aspects of citizen knowledge and attitude are made available to the nation's educators. Recently, their data on 1976 tests showed several areas of concern for those who prepare the nation's citizenry for active, adult lives. (See Appendix 3.) The question remains: What are state agencies going to do with this information?

In summary, citizen education and the problems of preparing effective future participants of American society have become major concerns of many nationally-oriented groups and organizations. State and local agencies have been encouraged to direct their immediate planning in this area, to determine need in their states and to develop goals and objectives for sound programs in the field of citizenship. The activities over the past six months in Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Delaware should be seen

in terms of this background of a national perspective and with regard to the educational research concerns that are inherent in educational program development.

Tri-State Needs and Goals in Citizen Education

During the past six months all three states of the tri-state region have established state planning groups to guide the policy and to determine the activities of the collaborative research and development effort in citizen education between their state and Research for Better Schools. In two states, Pennsylvania and New Jersey, the same steps of dialogue between RBS and the state Departments of Education have been pursued. Definition of what citizen education means has been an active topic of discussion at planning group meetings. Both states saw the need to carry the discussion to a larger citizen group, to a conference at which many sectors of Pennsylvania or New Jersey society were represented. Both states saw it necessary to relate their thinking on citizen education to their existing school improvement programs such as Project 81 and Educational Quality Assessment in Pennsylvania, and "thorough and efficient" education in New Jersey. (See State Citizen Education Planning Groups: Final Report, May 31, 1978.) Both states identified a requisite to establish need for citizen education in their state and to begin to develop goals or objectives for such education in terms of that need. Similarly, they also both stressed the importance of relating their own state's activity to academic research and to a sound knowledge base on what citizen education is in current social or behavioral terms.

The two state conferences held during the past six months are the best synopses of the substance of concerns raised in Pennsylvania and New Jersey in initiating their state efforts in citizen education. In Pennsylvania, (see Appendix 3) criteria for state objectives were set by the conference participants, as well as general objective areas. Strategies for developing a statewide effort were discussed and ways of integrating the new thrust in citizen education with ongoing programs of the Pennsylvania Department of Education were suggested. Future guidance for the Pennsylvania planning groups was also a by-product of the Harrisburg meeting.

The New Jersey conference was launched with a need statement from the Commissioner of Education underlining citizen concerns in New Jersey as the philosophical base for all education in the state. The futures orientation and the workshop aspects of the New Jersey meeting set the stage for a meaningful exchange among the participants. (See Appendix 4.) The afternoon session of the conference concentrated on developing an extensive list of outcomes that participants envisioned New Jersey citizens should be able to do as they approached the twenty-first century. How the state planning groups should achieve this was not yet well elaborated.

In Pennsylvania and New Jersey, then, the bases of need for and the goals of citizen education have been formed. Much more integrative work on the part of the state planning groups is called for. For instance, in Pennsylvania the results of Educational Quality Assessment and the

National Assessment of Educational Progress data should be analyzed for Pennsylvania's students. In New Jersey, strategies for organizing the citizen education effort within the long-range "thorough and efficient" education plan must still be worked out. But where the goals are parallel and the objectives clear, there should be no difficulty in developing a common program.

In Delaware, activities in citizen education are focused in the new state priority that seeks to serve two ends: information to education decision makers and increased student achievement. That there is need to have such a priority in Delaware's planning for the years ahead has recently been established. (See Appendix 6.) Exactly what goals or objectives will serve such a priority is yet to be determined. The Delaware Department of Public Instruction is discussing a statewide meeting with Research for Better Schools and it is anticipated that at such a meeting more exact objectives for citizen education in the state can be formulated.

Summary

Research for Better Schools has worked with all three states of the tri-state region in developing need statements and educational objectives in citizen education. That need exists in the citizen area has been affirmed in all three states. Conferences in Pennsylvania and New Jersey have resulted in goals expressed for these states in terms of ongoing school improvement programs. Objectives have been generated by conference participants from various public and private sectors of both states. In Pennsylvania, strategies have been suggested for integrating a citizen

education effort with ongoing statewide educational programs. Planning groups in both states need to pursue these plans further.

In Delaware, the new state priority in citizen education is just being proposed to the State Board. The relevance of the new priority to the national perspective on citizen education is strongly felt. The Delaware planning group must plan the direction it wants the priority to take over the next five year period. There is a strong chance, at this time, that they will advocate a statewide conference jointly sponsored with Research for Better Schools during the next academic year. As the new priority program develops in Delaware, and as the desegregation plans of the state are implemented, the focus of such a meeting is likely to emerge.

REFERENCES

Butts, R. Freeman. Education for citizenship. Vital issues (Vol. 26). Washington, Conn.: Center for Information on America, 1977.

National Task Force on Citizenship Education. Education for responsible citizenship: The report of the national task force on citizenship education. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1977.

Shaver, James P. (Ed.). Building rationales for citizenship education (Bulletin 52). Arlington, Va.: National Council for the Social Studies, 1977.

U.S. Department of Health Education and Welfare, Office of Education. Education and citizenship: A conference report. Washington, D.C., 1976.

APPENDIX 1

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION,
COUNCIL OF CHIEF STATE SCHOOL OFFICERS (1976)

EFFECTIVE CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION: A Basic Goal of Education in the United States

1976
Committee on Citizenship Education
Council of Chief State School Officers
(Reprinted by permission)

"A people who mean to be their own governors must arm themselves with the power which knowledge gives." With these words, James Madison expressed a concept of citizen education which many Americans have held from the early days of this Republic to the present. Thus, in our country, Americans have considered universal education to be a prerequisite for the success of the "American political experiment." Indeed, much of the effort in American education, including the teaching of the "3R's", can be interpreted as the preparation of citizens for civic obligations. State laws have required instruction in federal, state and local government. In addition, elementary teachers and secondary teachers of social studies have planned and conducted instructional activities relevant to citizenship education that usually go far beyond mandated requirements.

It is the intention of the Council of Chief State School Officers to reaffirm, through this paper, the position that a primary function of public schools in this nation is to prepare students for responsible citizenship, with emphasis on participation in the political process and in the betterment of society. Such a position is particularly important now, for public issues in their increasing complexity are nonetheless of vital interest to our citizens, if they are to understand and function effectively in contemporary society. The ideals of liberty, justice and equality today depend more than ever on an enlightened citizenry. Whether the American social and political environment will be one where people in future years can live and flourish in freedom relates directly to how well our schools fulfill their obligation of preparing students for their roles as responsible decision-makers and concerned citizens.

This paper has three sections, each of which addresses a broad question for renewing effectiveness in citizenship education.

The current status of citizenship education
Goals for citizenship education
How might the Nation improve citizenship education?

I. THE CURRENT STATUS OF CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

Although citizenship education has been a major concern of the United States throughout its history, Americans by no means agree on what "effective citizenship" is, or how it is accomplished. Terms such as, "obedient," "law abiding," "participant," "reformer," and "informed" are all used to describe "the good citizen." However, if asked to define and rank these terms in describing "the good citizen," Americans might find it difficult to reach an agreement. Perhaps we can expect only a loose consensus since freedom in a democratic system extends for the individual the right to define "the good citizen" and "effective citizenship," each in his own way.

Despite lack of agreement on the precise meaning of the term, "the good citizen," there are some common assumptions regarding the purposes of citizenship education — namely citizenship education should:

1) Contribute to the student's knowledge and understanding of civic affairs and political institutions and processes;
2) Increase the student's understanding of personal responsibilities and rights and the rights of others;
3) Raise the student's awareness of citizen-group activities and goals and their significance;
4) Contribute toward the student's responsible participation in civic affairs.

In American schools our students now engage in a variety of activities related to citizenship education. Despite these school efforts, research studies reveal continuing areas of weakness in citizen action. For example, a large proportion of Americans participate little, if at all, in the political processes. Even the right to vote, which in this Nation requires little effort, is not exercised by many Americans. Even women's suffrage and the lowered voting age has not substantially improved the situation. Many nonvoters, when asked why they failed to vote in a recent election, cited lack of interest in politics as their reason. Surveys also reveal that few Americans have an in-depth understanding of how the government works, and many citizens do not recognize or support some of the basic rights found in the United States Constitution. Unfortunately, the lack of concern for fundamental rights is not restricted to "ordinary" citizens, as the Watergate episode illustrated.

Not only do many Americans fail to participate in political decision-making, but many have shown a tendency to disregard their responsibilities to others and to long-cherished institutions. In many instances, individuals have turned their backs on others in need, not wanting to get involved, and some people have tried to secure their demands through destruction of property and a disregard for the rights and basic needs of others. These current day societal problems have implications for, and point up the necessity of, more effective citizenship education.

There is a gap between the goals for citizenship and some of the practices of our citizens. This may be partially due to the fact that citizenship education, in many cases, is limited to in-the-classroom study of state and national history and government. That concept of citizenship education needs to be expanded to include activities which promote citizen participation not only in the political decision-making process, but also in the areas of social awareness and group responsibilities.

We need not look back to a time when good citizenship existed in this Nation, or when good civic education was practiced, for those times were probably never really as good as we remember. What we must do, however, is consider the basic principles of American government as they relate to the complexities of society today in defining goals for effective citizenship education, and, from this consideration, plan activities which promote the individual's participation in the political decision-making process and in the social construction of a better society for all citizens.

II. GOALS FOR CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

The Council of Chief State School Officers proposes that all schools consider the seven goals for effective citizenship education listed below. Following each goal are statements

which illustrate the meaning of the goal. Underlying these goals and their illustrations is the assumption that citizenship education should not only deal with the rights of the individual citizen, but must also deal with the responsibilities of the individual for the betterment of society through participation in civic and group affairs. The goals and objectives are presented in general terms, partly to stimulate further discussion, and partly because it is questionable whether educators should be overly specific in delineating these particular goals and objectives or in assigning priorities to them. It is simply not the function of public schools in a free society to tell students what to think and do in areas of controversy, rather they should help students understand the issue, the probable consequences, and the different points of view so that they are able to make well-informed decisions and act responsibly. We must not forget that cherished values like freedom, justice, equality, and general welfare often conflict in specific cases and that intelligent adults often differ on how those cases should be resolved (e.g., the Supreme Court has its dissenting opinions).

Not only are the goals general, but the terms used to express these goals are to be understood in their broadest meanings. For example, "citizen," as used in this paper, refers not only to those who by law are citizens, it refers also to people living in the United States as aliens, but still share many of the same rights and civic obligations that our legal citizens have. The term "civic skills" also has a broad meaning, referring not only to skills needed to participate intelligently in the political system as voter, jury member, politician, or lobbyist, but also to skills needed to participate effectively in groups that play important roles in determining the quality of life in our society. "Civic skills" include the ability to make accurate, critical evaluations of media information as well as those abilities involved in listening, communicating ideas, and encouraging others to express themselves — all skills needed for constructive participation in social groups.

SEVEN GOALS FOR CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

1. The effective citizen should demonstrate concern for the dignity and well-being of self, family, and others, which includes:
   - —Treating others with respect and offering help when needed;
   - —Supporting equal opportunity for all;
   - —Considering the consequences of one's behavior on the dignity and well-being of others.
2. The effective citizen should support the concept of governance by law and oppose unjust applications, which includes:
   - —Understanding the need for law;
   - —Understanding the processes by which laws are made and changed;
   - —Supporting law enforcement by appropriate action;
   - —Working toward the revision or repeal of unjust laws.
3. The effective citizen should support rights and freedoms important for human development, which includes:
   - —Recognizing and fulfilling ethical and moral commitments;
   - —Recognizing and understanding basic constitutional principles and rights;
   - —Applying constitutional principles and rights in making and judging political decisions;
   - —Acting to uphold the rights of all people.
4. The effective citizen should understand the structure, functions, and actual processes of governments, which includes:
   - -Understanding basic purposes of government;
   - -Understanding the need for a variety of political opinions in democratic governments;
   - —Understanding the roles played by interest groups in democratic political processes;
   - —Understanding that democracy is dependent upon citizen involvement;
   - —Accepting and fulfilling civic responsibilities related to the effective functioning of government.
5. The effective citizen should understand that civic action is essential and that he or she should participate actively in civic improvement, which includes:
   - —Recognizing that each person's civic participation is important;
   - —Understanding the many different ways by which one can personally and practically participate in activities which lead to civic improvement;
   - —Participating in planning, implementing, and evaluating activities for civic improvements;
   - —Assisting others in developing civic skills, in developing their personal set of values, and in achieving their potential.
6. The effective citizen should have an understanding of and concern for world affairs; as well as national, state, and local civic issues, which includes:
   - —Recognizing that social, economic, and political conflicts exist;
   - —Recognizing and understanding how world, national, state, and local events and trends are often interrelated;
   - —Understanding how civic policies affect people's lives;
   - —Being aware of major civic problems, considering alternative solutions, and seeking ethical ways to cope with and/or resolve the problems;
   - —Making serious efforts to keep informed about civic issues of importance.
7. The effective citizen should use rational processes when making civic decisions, which include:
   - —Identifying the issues involved, and recognizing which values (liberty, freedom, equality, justice, peace, etc), if any, are in conflict;
   - —Seeking relevant information and alternative viewpoints on civicly important questions;
   - —Evaluating civic communications and actions carefully as a basis for forming and changing one's own views;
   - —Acting responsibly, and being able to justify opinions and actions.

III. HOW MIGHT THE NATION IMPROVE EDUCATION?

There are many ways citizenship education might be improved in the United States. The following suggestions are provided for consideration:

1. State and local boards of education and various national, state, and local organizations or professional educators could indicate support of this paper or create their own discussion paper on effective citizenship education.
2. The U.S. Commissioner of Education could organize and hold national conferences in order to generate recommendations on how citizenship education might be improved. The American Bar Association and state and local bar associations, as well as other national groups, could be among the participants in such conferences.

3. Model programs of citizenship education could be identified and disseminated so that those programs, or parts thereof, that are easily exported may be implemented by districts that find the programs compatible with their philosophies of citizenship education.
4. A TV special could be developed similar to the National Citizenship Test that was produced by CBS in 1965. Possible funding sponsors might include: the major networks, the U. S. Office of Education, the Education Commission of the States, the Council of Chief State School Officers, private foundations, civic and labor groups, or professional, legal and educational groups. The Bicentennial year or decade would be an excellent time for this activity.
5. Regional and state conferences, involving lay people, students, and educators, might be organized to discuss and consider the questions raised in this paper.
6. Curriculum developers and publishing companies have developed citizenship education curriculum materials (textbooks, filmstrips, video-cassettes, simulations, et cetera). These materials could be listed in an annotated bibliography which related the materials to each of the seven goals, and the bibliography disseminated to appropriate local educators.
7. Programs to encourage young people to register and to vote could be developed and implemented in high schools and colleges. Other forms of meaningful political participation might be provided for young people, such as: observing state and local boards in action; serving on advisory councils; and service opportunities with selected governmental offices at local, state, and national levels.
8. Local school personnel could examine conditions in their own schools to see whether they promote the values of a democratic society by helping students develop increased maturity in dealing with meaningful issues. Such conditions that might be examined locally are suggested by the questions below:

—Are students given the opportunity to offer ideas for improvement? Are the ideas of students treated with respect? Are students encouraged to hear and evaluate the ideas of their classmates?

—Are students given increased responsibilities in school as they get older? As they get older, do they have more opportunity to influence decisions that affect them in the classroom and school?

—Are students expected to live up to obligations they have to the school and their classmates?

—Are decision-making processes of this and other societies studied with an emphasis on realism, on recent scholarship, and on how the actual decision-making processes relate to principles of constitutional government?

—Do students study policy questions that pose fundamental issues in this society? Does such study help students understand conflicting political values and other complexities? Does it help students develop productive inquiry and decision-making strategies?

—Are civicly active people involved as volunteers to assist the teacher in specific instructional activities? Are students offered internships in community service field experience programs in government and civic organizations? (Such experiences could involve internships for credit in such places as courts, government buildings, hospitals, departments of education, police departments, environmental organizations, and labor and business organizations.)

The eight suggestions above might be discussed in a variety of ways throughout the nation. They may be used separately or in combination. It is our hope that the ideas will be refined in discussion and expanded with the result that citizenship education in the United States will be improved significantly.

APPENDIX 2

POSITION STATEMENT OF THE PENNSYLVANIA
COUNCIL FOR THE SOCIAL STUDIES

THE PENNSYLVANIA COUNCIL FOR THE SOCIAL STUDIES

POSITION STATEMENT: CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

It is the official position of the Pennsylvania Council for the Social Studies that the main purpose of social studies education is to prepare students for effective citizenship in the many communities in which he/she must function successfully. The student must be educated to become an effective citizen of the family, school, local, state, national and global communities.

The education of students for effective citizenship in the diverse and interrelated communities in which he/she is to live requires a coordinated, K-12, curricular program with three basic components: skills, knowledge, and attitudes. These three components should be systematically developed within each course offering and throughout the curriculum as a whole.

Given our position on citizenship education, courses in American studies, world cultures, minority studies, our legal system, the individual social sciences and intergroup relations (to name a few) would be included in a citizenship education program. A Social Studies Department's citizenship education program should not be so narrow as to consist of only Civics and U.S. History course, and conversely it should not be so broad as to include such courses as Driver's Education and Public Speaking for these latter courses rightfully rest in the domains of other departments. In all courses, heavy emphasis should be placed on the development and application of thinking, problem-solving, and interpersonal/intergroup skills. The application of learnings should include student involvement in community studies and activities.

While the Social Studies Department rightfully assumes a leadership role in a district's citizenship education effort, the total school and community must share the responsibility for this effort.

The Pennsylvania Council for the Social Studies, as the professional organization devoted exclusively to promoting social studies education and serving social studies educators, stands ready to play a leadership role in the effort toward improving citizenship education in Pennsylvania.

APPENDIX 3

NATIONAL ASSESSMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PROGRESS BULLETIN

NAEP Bulletin
NATIONAL ASSESSMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PROGRESS
1860 Lincoln Street, Denver, Colorado 80295 • (303) 861-4917

16

CONTACT: Gloria Frazier
Wash. D.C., International Inn
1/30 - 2/2, 1978
(202) 783-4600
Denver, Colo.
(303) 861-4917

Jeanine Bays
(303) 861-4917

RADIO NEWS RELEASE

FOR A.M. RELEASE, FEB. 2, 1978

WASHINGTON, D.C.

During the first half of the 1970s U.S. teenagers:

- Showed declines in their knowledge of the structure and function of government.
- Lost ground in their understanding of and willingness to participate in the political process.
- Mixed successes with declines in recognizing and valuing constitutional rights.

However, through the turbulent era that included the Vietnam war, the Watergate scandal and campus riots, some of these same young students gained in showing respect for the poor and for people of other races, in understanding the need for law in a democratic society and in describing ways to avoid future wars.

-more-

Education Commission of the States

National Assessment is funded by the National Center for Education Statistics, Office of the Assistant Secretary for Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare and is under contract with the Education Commission of the States.

NATIONAL ASSESSMENT Radio - 2

These are among major findings reported by the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), which is funded by the National Center for Education Statistics. The assessments found changes in political knowledge and attitudes among the nation's 13- and 17-year-olds between the early '70s and 1976. About 145,000 teenagers participated in the surveys.

The 1976 study found that the ability to explain the basic concept of democracy had declined 12 percentage points for 17-year-olds and 11 percentage points for 13-year-olds.

Although the second assessment of citizenship and social studies was conducted during a Presidential election year, considerable uncertainty existed about how Presidential candidates are selected: On one item measuring such knowledge, 17-year-olds' performance showed a sharp 14 percentage-point decline, from 50% to 36%.

National Assessment also found that knowledge of local government dropped. Approximately 70% of the 17-year-olds identified their state's governor in 1976, a decline of 13 percentage points from some six years earlier. When asked about a state assembly, 55% in 1976 identified it as belonging to the legislative branch of government, a decline of 14 percentage points. A substantial 22% in 1976 replied "I don't know" to the question. The percentage of students feeling they could influence their local government also declined, while the percentage feeling they could influence the national government increased.

-more-

NATIONAL ASSESSMENT Radio - 3

The assessments asked whether students recognized constitutional rights and whether they supported them. Performance on one item, concerning the rights of the accused, improved by 20 percentage points for 13-year-olds. According to the report, explanations for the change can only be suppositions, but the number of television shows featuring police and lawyers, as well as a marked increase in statewide citizenship and law-related education projects, might contribute to the improvement.

National Assessment is funded by the National Center for Education Statistics and is under contract with the Education Commission of the States.

-30-

EDITOR'S NOTE: A news conference on the citizenship and social studies assessment will be held Wednesday, Feb. 1, 2 p.m., in the Adams Room, Lobby Level, International Inn, 10 Thomas Circle, NW, Washington, D.C.

A limited supply of Changes in Political Knowledge and Attitudes, 1969-76 is available from National Assessment offices, 1860 Lincoln St., Denver, Colo. 80295. For press copies, contact Gloria Frazier or Jeanine Bays, (303) 861-4917.

The public may order the report from the same address for $2.45 per copy. A previous report, Education for Citizenship: A Bicentennial Survey, at $2.35 per copy, also is available.

APPENDIX 4

PROCEEDINGS OF CITIZEN EDUCATION
CONFERENCE, HARRISBURG, PENNSYLVANIA
FEBRUARY 14, 1978

PROCEEDINGS OF CITIZEN EDUCATION CONFERENCE

HARRISBURG, PENNSYLVANIA

FEBRUARY 14, 1978

Citizen Education
Development Division
Research for Better Schools, Inc.
Suite 1700/1700 Market Street
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103

PROCEEDINGS OF CITIZEN EDUCATION CONFERENCE
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania
February 14, 1978

The Citizen Education component of Research for Better Schools, Inc. (RBS) is exploring the possibility of establishing a partnership with statewide school improvement programs in a tri-state area (Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Delaware) in order to assist those states in their efforts to enable students to become more effective participants in democratic society. One of the first outcomes of this exploration of RBS and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania was a conference on citizen education, convened by Robert L. Schell, Chairperson of the Pennsylvania Citizen Education Committee. The conference was held on February 14, 1978, in Harrisburg, Pennsylvania. In attendance were members of the State Department of Education, members of the Citizen Education component of RBS, representatives from other state educational and public service organizations, and an administrative assistant from the state legislature.

The objectives of the conference were:

- To explore the need for and the possible scope of citizen education;
- To develop tentative objectives for citizen education;
- To explore the interest in establishing a statewide commitment to citizen education;
- To generate ideas concerning procedures for the creation of a statewide citizen education effort.

Despite the fact that attendance was reduced because of a heavy snowstorm, the conference was successful in meeting these objectives. The persons who were able to attend expressed a need for citizen education and a commitment to responding to this need, as well as specific suggestions as to what the scope of citizen education should be. They also expressed a common sense of direction for their efforts. Their interest and enthusiasm in suggesting directions for citizen education in the Commonwealth and objectives for a citizen education program were limited only by the amount of time alloted to the small group working sessions. There was also a generally positive reaction from the participants to the other conference sessions.

What follows is a transcription of the addresses presented at the conference (slightly edited for the printed page), a report on the work of the small discussion groups, and a report of the summation given at the end of the conference.

WELCOME TO PARTICIPANTS

The participants at the conference were welcomed by Frank S. Manchester, Commissioner for Basic Education in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. Dr. Manchester reviewed the need for citizen education programs in the state and outlined the ways in which the state department of education, through Project 81, has begun to respond to those needs. His address is given below.

During my last year as superintendent of a suburban school district outside Philadelphia, an eighth-grade teacher gave her students a test on their knowledge of government. The results were, as you might predict, somewhat disastrous. These eighth-grade students, who had come through the social studies curriculum which we had spent a number of years devising,

simply were not prepared to answer some pretty basic questions about their own government. For instance, they did not know that there are three branches of government in this country.

More recently the educational Quality Assessment (EQA) program [of the Pennsylvania Department of Education] repeated the test for the citizenship goal, this time including some knowledge elements as well as the attitudinal items used previously. As I recall the results, in the fifth-grade test the students were asked to name the capital of the state of Pennsylvania. About 30 to 40 percent of the students didn't know. Some thought it was Philadelphia, which may be understandable. A few thought it was Washington. A number of them possibly correctly picked Harrisburg by chance.

The National Assessment of Educational Program (NAEP) report which appeared a week or two ago clearly indicated the same kinds of results across the nation in terms of basic information about the American government and voters' responsibilities. The director of NAEP, speaking at a recent Project 81 conference, said that there had been a slight increase in the reading and math scores, but in citizenship the results showed a marked decline.

As I consider these test results, I am led to recall the long period before I came to the Commissioner's job, when I was working on curriculum, spending a great deal of time making all kinds of course changes and improvements in the area of social studies. I think of the pattern of what has happened in social studies over the last fifteen or twenty years. What was done was to, in fact, eliminate the European history course in favor of something called "world cultures." This was done for the very

laudable motive, it seems to me, of helping our students to be more aware of what's going on in the rest of the world and to become less narrow in their viewpoint as they react to other cultures. But at the same time, the European history course was not replaced with anything that gave students some sense of the concepts within our Western heritage. I think that has been a great failing in terms of where we are now. We do not insist that children have to know certain content.

We also replaced the twelfth-grade program of Problems of American Democracy (POD) with a series of electives in psychology and sociology which the students enjoyed much more than the courses in civics and economics that had been formerly offered. This pattern is not true of all schools, of course, because some still have POD or comparable courses. But not very many do. I would guess that most of the suburban schools or schools that have spent a good deal of time on curriculum have in fact dropped that particular program. They have a pattern that runs something like this: World cultures in tenth grade, American history in eleventh grade, and social science electives in twelfth grade. Even in the seventh through ninth grades the old civic courses tend to have been pushed out in favor of other kinds of programs.

Therefore, if you look at what has been wrought in terms of curriculum change, you will find no place where students would have any kind of required and concentrated study of their government. I recall that when I came to the particular suburban school system I mentioned earlier, the students had perhaps too much study of the U.S. Constitution. But when I left that system, they had virtually none. And I suspect that this pattern has been repeated in a number of school districts. Now the results of this pattern are reflected in the NAEP and other test scores.

Am I saying that a social studies program ought to be completely oriented toward government or toward factual knowledge, such as the capital of the state or the three branches of government? No! But I do think that if students don't get that kind of factual knowledge base, then we are in very serious trouble.

Now, I don't think that the problem necessarily lies in the courses that we offer. We probably do not have to go back again and redo the courses themselves. But what I think we must do is to find out what it is that we want students to have in order to function as citizens in our modern American technological society. What is it they need to know? What is it they need to be able to do?

We have made a start on this task in Pennsylvania through Project 81. For the last year, in twelve model districts (city, rural, and suburban) across the state, Project 81 has been asking thousands of citizens the question: When a student graduates from high school, he should be able to _____. We have literally hundreds of thousands of responses from all segments of the citizenry, telling us what they want their children to be able to do.

At the same time we are asking the State Board and the Intermediate Unit Boards of Education to take a look at the Quality Goals of Education set for the state and then express in very general and broad terms what it is they want the educational program in the Commonwealth to do.

Those two efforts are now complete and we are trying to link the two. As a result a new citizenship goal is being drafted. In the first draft form which has now been accepted by the State Board, this goal reads:

Quality education should assure that every child learn the history of the nation, and understand its systems of government and economics, and acquire the values and attitudes necessary for responsible citizenship. The change here is mainly in emphasis. The previous goals stated the attitudes and habits of citizenry but did not accent the cognitive part included in the new goal, the knowledge base that I think has been lacking in a number of our programs.

At the same time Project 81 came up with literally hundreds of responses concerning what students should be able to do when they graduate. The responses included such items as: use voting procedures, meet tax responsibilities, select candidates for public office, use governmental services, understand documents, and interact with other individuals and groups. This base of competency statements will now be examined over the next three or four months to determine the kind of knowledge and skills that students will need in order to be able to do these things, and further, the kind of attitudes we want students to have as a result of these learnings. So the end product will be a goal statement and a series of perhaps fifteen or so competency statements encompassing skills, knowledge, application of the skills and knowledge in like-role situations, and attitudes — all those things we think students ought to be able to do or to know. Those statements will, in fact, be the charge for the school district as one of the eleven major goals of the school system.

Now, how does the effort that Bob Schell and the department have launched in terms of looking at citizenship education fit into the picture? Well, we are not assuming in the Project 81 effort that we are necessarily going to find

all the answers in the twelve model districts, although we do think that it is a substantial community base and very representative of what is going on across the Commonwealth in terms of the views of the citizenry. What we would like to see is a concurrent effort on your [the Citizen Education Committee's] part. We are anticipating the fact that there will be an accent and a need and a priority given to citizenship. We have now a group in the Commonwealth that is beginning to take a good look at whatever it is we come out with in terms of the goal and competency statements in the area of citizenship education. We would like this group to give its substantive input to the final goal statement which will come probably in January of next year, and at the same time to try to anticipate what kinds of needs the schools have in terms of implementing these goal and competency statements -- not in the sense that we would mandate what should be done, but in the sense that we would provide a strong leadership role. We would say, "Here's what we think needs to be done in the programs across the Commonwealth."

I would plead with you [The Citizen Education Committee] to consider two things. One is that the schools need a better balance between the knowledge base and the application of the knowledge in real-life situations. John Dewey talked about the problem in education of framing major issues in either/or situations. But when he said that we needed to do more to give students opportunities to apply the knowledge and skills they learn in content areas to real-life situations, a number of people unfortunately took the ball and ran with it. They acted as if you didn't need any study in the content areas and you didn't need to develop any skills. Somehow the knowledge and skills

would all develop naturally as you were involved in making maps, going out into the community to visit fire stations, and the like. Obviously, that didn't happen.

I think we have to be very careful in what we do to avoid getting into an either/or argument. I remember that the State Board, in beginning its discussions of all the goals and this one in particular, was divided into two camps. One was saying,"We just have to study the history and the rest of it will take care of itself," and the other group was saying, "We have to get these kids out into the community and give them the experiences they need as a citizen if they are ever going to function effectively." But what happened through that whole discussion process is what I hope will happen across this Commonwealth as we get further into the matter of what citizenship education should comprise. The two camps began to realize that both their positions are necessary. It is not an either/or matter. We have simply got to give these students an opportunity to gain a solid knowledge base about their heritage and about their government and their economic system. But at the same time there must be built into the program opportunities for these children to apply those skills and knowledge, both in simulated experiences within the school and in real-life situations outside the school.

The second thing I would like you [the Committee] to consider is the need to give students some framework within which to develop their own citizenship skills. I think the best frame of reference we have is, in fact,

our Western heritage as it has been expressed in the Declaration of Independence and in the Constitution, and perhaps we should also bite the bullet and take a good look at our religious heritage, something we have tended not to do for a variety of reasons over the last ten or twenty years.

So then, my plea is for a balanced approach to the whole issue of citizenship that would include a strong knowledge base as well as opportunities for application of skills in addressing the affective parts of citizenship. And secondly, I urge that we address directly the whole issue of how you interweave the value structure of the Western heritage for students to use as a basis for determining for themselves how they want to function as a citizen. My hope is that you [The Citizen Education Committee] will stay with this effort, help us in setting the goals and competency statements for the State Board, and help us to determine what kind of leadership role the State ought to play in this very important area of citizenship.

A NEED FOR ACTION/SPECIFYING OBJECTIVES

Following Dr. Manchester's address, Robert Schell, Senior Social Studies Advisor to the Bureau of Curriculum Services in the State Education Department as well as chairperson of the State Citizen Education Committee, spoke to the participants concerning the societal problems that have brought about a call to reinvigorate citizen education in the state. He concluded by outlining the activities which the assembled group might attempt to carry out. The text of Dr. Schell's remarks follows.

Last week I met with a group of State Department of Education people to discuss how to foresee relating to citizenship education. It soon became

obvious that citizenship is such a broad and pervasive topic that it is very difficult to put one's finger on it. We found ourselves discussing whether indeed we should try to deal with a task like defining "citizenship."

But there does seem to be a general need for education in this area. It's interesting; I have been in social studies long enough to have seen the pendulum swing back and forth. Every time there is a crisis, there comes a call to reinvigorate citizen education in some way or another. Let me pose the problems as I see them that have brought about this current demand. Some of them refer to the lack of a knowledge base which Frank Manchester mentioned; some refer to other areas.

Number one is the increased discipline problem, vandalism and crime as an aspect of our present society. I've been out of the classroom for seven years and it is really difficult for me to relate to the real problems that are occurring in the schools today. But I know it is a very serious problem that is spreading from the cities outward; I think the cycle is almost completed. Citizenship education does have to do with behavior patterns and therefore is related to this problem.

Secondly is something that schools have very little to do with and yet it has a tremendous bearing on citizen education. That is the disenchantment with politics. The National Council for the Social Studies (NCSS) findings a few years ago showed that over 50 percent of the youth thought the political leadership did not care, were dishonest, etc. Pennsylvania politics seems to support this contention in spades. I could go on and on

with examples, but you are well aware of the situation, whether it's Watergate or the Marston affair or whatever it happens to be.

Third are changing family patterns. We do have this; there is no doubt about it. We have many, many more women working. We have many, many more families where there is only one parent involved. You have some patterns in which there are no parents involved, just the peer group siblings.

Another problem is the apathy that is existent, maybe as a result of this -- the withdrawal syndrome. Children are turning to drugs, to religious cults, to what have you, any escapism that exists. It's awfully easy today to look for that escapism.

Fifth, our society continues to be mobile. I saw something the other day that indicated mobility hasn't decreased a bit; in fact, maybe it's increased. There was a very interesting little program on 60 Minutes last week which showed some mobile homes and asked, "Why aren't they mobile? Just the people are."

Then there's television's effect. People will say, "Oh, no" to that and there is a great discussion back and forth. But it's not just the crime and violence on television; it's the fact that television has become the babysitter. Now there may be positive as well as negative effects, but that's a fact.

There is the depersonalization of our society. I work in a bureaucracy and it's depersonalized. Schools have increased in size, but there size is not the only key; it is the fact of how this building operates. I tend to

think -- and this is a fact that was emphasized in social studies -- we have to look at the entire environmental structure in the schools.

Then there are the low EQA and National Assessment scores which Frank Manchester already mentioned.

Now because of all these reasons, there has been a ground movement around the state and the nation. I attended a citizenship conference sponsored by USOE a year ago last September in Kansas City, which was concerned with these type problems. The National Council of Social Studies has a task force with a priority on citizenship education. Many of you attended the first meeting of the Alliance for Citizen Education, an attempt to form a national organization in Philadelphia, which was not just composed of educators but dealt with community groups, labor representatives and others.

So there is increased concern for citizen education. But there's another factor, too. If we just go back and attempt to resurrect Problems of Democracy courses and other programs of that nature, that is not the answer. I was editor of several POD books and I couldn't concur with Frank more that the answer is not in the course structure, but in defining what is meant. I always felt that we could go out and pick someone off the street and come into most POD courses and hold the bull sessions we had. They really were not the answer.

There are some new movements in the field of education itself I think we have to take cognizance of. I won't elaborate on them, but there are law-related education -- in which Pennsylvania has been somewhat of a leader -- and global interdependence, whether we are speaking of the economic, the environmental, the social, the political or the foreign policy aspects. There are concerns of all citizens. And there is another major move --

moral values education. Frank mentioned the fact that we were concerned in the original EQA test with attitudes and values. There is a whole host of approaches to this area. But in our pluralistic society, we still have to have some commitment to some basic democratic principles, both individual and group. Principles such as human dignity, justice, political integrity, and equality of opportunity. And the Kettering Foundation Survey indicated that 79 percent of the parents wanted moral education, despite the fact that we have heard things to the contrary in the press. Lastly, the social sciences have brought forth some ideas that we have to deal with: the economic realities, such concepts as power, sovereignty, authority, consensus, compromise, socialization, freedom, and decision making. These are concepts from different social science disciplines.

Now, what is the importance of your involvement today? I hope that we can redefine or start to redefine the scope of citizen education, not just as a concern of the social studies, although this may be the keystone. It also involves a larger commitment of both formal and informal education — the school and the community. One of the reasons for this meeting is to attempt to bring attention to this need for citizenship education.

I also think it is important that we look at citizenship education not just from the view of not either/or, but that we look at alternative programs. There may be more than one reason, and there may be more than one answer.

And finally, this group hopefully can serve as a coordinator of activities -- of local, school and community activities, and of state and national activities. These are some of the things that we hope will transpire with our small groups today.

MORNING SMALL GROUP SESSIONS

This portion of the program was introduced by Russell A. Hill, Senior Research Fellow of the Citizen Education component of RBS. Dr. Hill first clarified the role of RBS in the state citizen education effort and in the conference, by pointing out that it is not the task of RBS to define citizen education for the state. Rather, the task of RBS is to facilitate and to assist the state department of education as it moves into the area of citizen education over the next several years.

The participants were then divided into two groups. One was chaired by Galen Godbey, Special Assistant to the Secretary of Education, with Nicholas Sanders, Research Coordinator for the CE component of RBS, serving as recorder. The other was chaired by Elizabeth Haller, Social Studies Advisor in the Bureau of Curriculum Services with Suzanne Root, Survey Coordinator for the CE component of RBS, serving as recorder. The principal task of the groups was to attempt to define what is meant by citizen education by stipulating what were their concerns in this area and what objectives they thought should be included in a citizen education program.

There was general consensus that a citizen education program should be:

1. Relevant. It should appear to be realistic to the students and should appeal to their interests.
2. Flexible. It should provide options for local districts and schools with choices available in both objectives and actual programs.
3. Inclusive. The program should extend through all the years of schooling. It should seek to involve parents and the

community and address itself to developing skills and attitudes as well as knowledge.

4. Integrative. It should seek to integrate the many diverse elements that are part of citizen education, including knowledge of legal documents (such as the Federal and state constitution and local charters), knowledge of local and state as well as federal government, decision-making skills, values education, and the implementation of the democratic principles of equity, justice, and rationality.

The objectives generated by the groups covered the following areas;

1. Knowledge base in law, political structure, and social, political and economic issues.
2. Planning, inquiry, interpersonal, and decision-making skills.
3. Development of positive attitudes toward those in authority, and of concern and respect for all other persons.
4. Understanding of the rights and responsibilities of individuals, of economics, of government operation, of basic national, state and local documents, and of the basic concepts in the social sciences needed to analyse society.
5. Multiethnic studies.
6. Global education.
7. Community participation.

PROMOTING CITIZEN COMPETENCE

The guest speaker for the conference was Richard C. Remy, Director of the Citizen Development Program of the Mershon Center, Ohio State University. Speaking on "Promoting Citizen Competence," Dr. Remy offered eight criteria for use in designing new approaches to citizen education and raised three questions which should be considered in such an effort. His address is given below.

It's hard to know what to say to a widely diverse and knowledgeable group like yourselves; so what I will try to do is to pull together a number of things that I think we probably have floating around in our collective consciousness. But before I start to do that, let me say that working on problems of citizenship education, in my judgment, is somewhat like trying to climb a mountain. You can see the goal sort of fuzzily in the distance, you can see where you want to go, but how to get there is really a very difficult question. You start to climb one route and you discover, although it gets you up a little way, that it's a blind alley. Then you have to go back down a bit and try another route. That other route may get you a little further toward your goal, but again it turns out to be a blind alley. Over time and by successive approximations, you keep at it, hoping that eventually you will reach that goal and that as you get closer, it will become more clear to you. But there certainly aren't any easy solutions.

The other thing I want to say by way of preface is that I come from an organization called the Mershon Center, which is a social science research and development center at Ohio State. I direct a little program there called the Citizenship Development Program. What we are trying to do is to serve as a bridge or a link between the university community and the world of schools, the world of practice. Our fundamental assumption is that both have something to learn from each other. Indeed, universities generate new knowledge about the human condition, and the schools have something to learn from universities.

On the other hand, universities have a great deal to learn from people in the world of the schools. So we try, through a number of activities, to bridge this gap between the world of the universities and the world of the schools. It's from the basis of that experience that I want to talk to you today, as well as from our experience in developing curriculum materials and working with various groups like yourselves.

With that as preface, I want to talk about two things today. First, I want to suggest eight criteria for the work you are going to be doing in the months and years ahead. And second, I want to pose several questions for which I don't have the answers, but which I think may make an important difference in your work if you think about them. Let me begin with the criteria.

CRITERIA FOR NEW APPROACHES TO CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

1. *New approaches to citizenship education should make good use of existing materials and resources.*

This first criterion that I want to suggest is one I won't spend very much time on. Quite simply, I think that as you design new approaches to citizen education, you should remember to make good use of existing materials and resources. You know this as well as I do; so this is really a reminder. During the sixties and seventies some very good curriculum materials in the areas of social studies and citizenship were developed. I think that you want to try not to reinvent the wheel or spend your time in areas where there are good materials available. The sort of information gathering and research that RBS is doing will help to alleviate that problem, because they are going to be compiling information about existing materials, programs, centers and organizations. So, simply by way of a reminder, don't forget some of the good things that are already out there.

2. *New approaches to citizenship education should strike a balance.*

This second criterion is really sort of a reminder too. I added this one after I heard what your Commissioner had to say earlier. And I was glad to hear it reflected in the small groups. It is, try to strike a balance. We are constantly swinging back and forth in education. We seem to need to do things by extremes. Either we're doing all moral education or we are doing all legalistic, institutional education, or we are doing all affective education. Yet we know that competent citizenship involves a blend of all these things.

I think it is particularly difficult to strike a balance with the narrow legalistic conception of citizenship, that is, the citizen is one who votes. Voting is important, but we all know it is only one aspect of good citizenship. It is sort of what Fred Newmann calls the Good Scout syndrome, with the citizen (male or female) evidencing the attributes found in the Boy Scout Creed: that is, the citizen is clean, reverent, loyal, etc., etc. I am not against those as qualities of citizenship, but the danger is in defining citizenship as everything and therefore it becomes nothing. You have to strike some kind of balance between these two extremes, I think. It's easier said than done, but you really should pose that as a criterion for yourselves. When you are developing programs, ask yourselves periodically, where are we on this potential continuum? Have we inadvertently drifted off so that in effect what we are doing really represents a very legalistic, narrowly focused approach? Or, is what we are doing so broad that everything is relevant and therefore there is no way to distinguish citizenship from anything else?

3. *New approaches to citizenship education should enable children and adults to see the political in their everyday lives as personally meaningful.*

With those two reminders in effect, the third criterion I would like to suggest to you is that new approaches to citizenship education should enable children and adults to see the political in their everyday lives. That is, the approaches must be personally meaningful. I think that this kind of criterion excludes, then, any view of citizenship that simply

equates politics with government or the formal institutions of government. When we take that approach in our citizenship education programs, we are really saying that citizenship is an adult phenomenon that children or students can study from a distance and for which they can prepare, but in which they cannot participate as citizens until they reach adulthood. Then they can vote, they can work in campaigns, they can pay taxes, they can run for office; in short, they can be citizens. When you take that approach to thinking about citizenship, it is very difficult to devise programs which are personally meaningful for students.

There was some talk earlier in the group meeting in the back of the room about the importance of state government, and I couldn't agree more. State and local government is terribly important for people. Yet, it is difficult to sit down and think about how you are going to, in any way that excites them, teach seventh graders about the responsibilities of the judiciary committee and the state legislature. Yet, it is important and can affect their lives in many ways.

Now, I am not going to try to suggest answers on how to make a linkage between the personal experience of a seventh grader and the judiciary committee and the state legislature. But I think it can be done, if you think creatively about it and if you look at citizenship in a way that I am going to suggest in a moment.

To ask you to follow this criterion is, in effect, to say that the political world of the students you will be dealing with has at least two parts. The first part is what we normally think of as adult politics.

We know that our students are aware of the larger adult political world. They are aware of it because they read the newspapers, they see television, they hear their parents talking at the dinner table about how the governor's a bum or the governor is great, or of how Carter is wrong or right about this or that. The kids are aware of these things. They know that all these things are going on. They hear about them. This is, indeed, part of their political world.

But there is another part which I think traditional civics programs have ignored. That is what we tend to call the natural political world. This is the politics that are found in students' everyday lives when they confront problems of governance. How do we govern our classrooms, how do we govern our school, how do we make rules for our club, how do we decide when somebody new comes into our neighborhood whether to include or exclude them? These are problems having to do with group governance, with how the various groups to which a student belongs manage themselves. These are political in a very fundamental sense, and this is the other side of the political world of students.

What I think you ought to do is to try to find ways to merge these two sides so that you can use the students' everyday political experiences to help them understand the larger adult political world. For example, take the phenomenon of decision making as a basic task of citizenship. Everybody has to make decisions. Now, students make decisions in their everyday lives; and I think you can move from teaching them about decision making in their everyday lives to teaching them about the fact that people who manage the ups which we call the United States, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania,

The State of Ohio, and the City of Harrisburg also make decisions. And in many ways, the fundamental elements of decision making are the same. When the Mayor makes a decision, he/she has to think of consequences, think of alternatives, set goals, and so on and so forth. So I think there are ways to move back and forth. You need to try to do that if you are going to make civics programs personally meaningful.

4. *New approaches to citizenship education should build competence with enduring tasks and tensions.*

The fourth criterion I would like to suggest is that new approaches to citizenship education should develop people's competence with what I would call the enduring tasks and tensions of citizenship. I noticed in the group meeting in the back, for example, a list of goals that was posited for citizenship education. I think the goals are very sound -- "understanding the legislative branch of government, understanding the national government, understanding economics, understanding moral development, understanding . . ." My question is, what is this understanding supposed to be for? How is it to be used? My suggestion is that it should be used to help people become more competent with the tasks they face everyday as citizens and which are inescapable.

Let me give you just a few examples of tasks which I think black people, yellow people and white people, rich people and poor people, dumb people and smart people all face. People face the task of acquiring valid and reliable information about political issues and problems that they confront. And that is becoming increasingly difficult as we have this

information explosion in our society. For example, I try to make some sense out of the barrage of statistics and data I get from other people arguing about whether social mobility in this country is increasing or decreasing. How do I get the information to make a decision about that kind of actual claim? Where do I acquire information about that?

A second sort of task is making moral and pragmatic judgments about people and public issues and politics. Everybody faces that task. Some people may handle it competently and others may handle it incompetently. Rich people may have more resources to deal with that task than poor people, but the task is inescapable.

A third basic task of citizenship is taking action in political situations. At some time or another in their lives, unless people are living as hermits, they face the challenge of trying to influence the decisions of others. Whether it be to influence the state legislature to change the speed limits on the highways, to influence one's neighbor not to put up that 17 foot fence, or to influence President Carter to realize there is a coal shortage in Ohio -- those tasks are inescapable.

So what I want to suggest to you is that good citizenship education programs should focus on building competency with these kinds of tasks. Then they should ask, what does someone need to know to acquire reliable and relevant information? What does someone need to know to influence political actions? Indeed, I would argue that you need to know a great deal about the legislative process if you are going to exercise influence. Even if you are not going to exercise influence, if you are only going to exercise sensible judgment, you have to have some basic understanding of

the legislative process. But, I want to suggest that you first think in terms of tasks and what it is that people have to do out there. Then apply what we know from the social sciences, what we know from history, and what we know from everything else to helping people with those tasks and tensions.

By "tensions" I mean a set of enduring dilemmas that are inescapable in our social life. Let me give you three examples. One, under what conditions should I as a citizen of a family, or as a citizen of a city, a nation, or as a citizen of a global community, be proud and loyal of my group, and when should I be critical? There are times when loyalty is called for, and there are times when criticism is called for. This was a real tension in citizenship during the Vietnam War.

A second example: under what conditions should I as a citizen comply with the laws or the norms or the rules of my group and support its political authorities -- whether they be the principal or the governor or the President -- and when should I defy the rules and authorities? Again, a very basic tension of citizenship. One final example: under what conditions should I, as a citizen of a group, actively participate in the political life of the group and, if necessary, sacrifice for the common good and when should I assert my privateness or withdraw? There may be times when the most sensible thing to do as a citizen is to get out, get away, withdraw, don't participate. And other times, the best thing to do for both one's own benefit and the welfare of one's group is to participate.

I'm not suggesting that we provide students with the answers; I'm suggesting we equip people with the knowledge and skills to cope better with these tensions.

5. *New approaches to citizenship education should recognize that increasing global interdependence is changing the nature of citizenship.*

This fifth criterion I won't say as much as I would like to about because you have a real expert in your midst in the person of Bob Schell, who has done a lot of work with and who has a strong interest in global education. I think he'll be a real resource person for the group over the months ahead.

But it is really terribly important to recognize the increasing global interdependence. It is changing the nature of citizenship and it is affecting citizenship. Harlan Cleveland wrote that we should recognize that global interdependence is not something to be for or against, but a fact to be lived with now and reckoned with in the future. So I think in this country we are past the days when people were debating whether interdependence was a good thing or not, as if they could do something about it if they concluded it was not good.

The question is, what are the implications of interdependence in designing citizenship education programs? I would say at a minimum the implications of global interdependence are that people now confront those enduring tasks and tensions of citizenship, which I mentioned earlier, in a global or internationalized context. Longshoremen when they decided not to load grain on ships bound for Russia were making what we might call

individual foreign policy decisions. They were coping with the task of citizenship, making decisions in a global or international context.

The second implication I would suggest is that local global linkages, the ways in which our own cities and states are linked to the rest of the world, mean that citizenship in our city or our state or our nation is not something apart from global citizenship. A recent example can be found at Ohio University. The Board of Trustees of Ohio University recently voted to withdraw all university investments with firms dealing with South Africa. That is a foreign policy decision made by a local group and it had nothing to do with the national government of the United States or with Henry Kissinger or with Cyrus Vance. It is a foreign policy decision made by individual citizens. And it wouldn't be made, I would say, if we weren't living in an increasingly globalized context.

Programmatically, I am going to suggest something which is a lot harder to do than to suggest -- that is, in the future I think we have to try to infuse a global perspective across the board in the curriculum. It is hard to do because we have this sort of ice cube tray situation in the curriculum. All our courses are slotted and if we want to put something new in, we have to take one cube out. For example, a couple of days ago a principal was telling me that the State Department of Arizona has recently mandated a semester of free enterprise instruction for eighth and ninth grades in Arizona. All the principals are tearing their hair out trying to figure out how to do that. The problem is that if a free enterprise cube goes in, something else has to come out.

I would suggest that for some subjects and topics, that is perhaps appropriate. But it is not appropriate for global education because we are dealing with a phenomenon which is of a different order, logically and empirically, than free enterprise education. That is important in its place, but this is a different type of phenomenon and it calls, I think, for an infusion across the board in the curriculum to the extent that we can do it. It's easier said than done, but I will deal with that problem when I move to the next criteria.

6. *New approaches to citizenship education should recognize that citizenship is becoming more complex.*

As a sixth criterion, I think new approaches to citizenship education should recognize that citizenship is becoming more complex. Let me put it simply. Our country was once a very simple society and today we are a very highly complex society. As social complexity increases, the task of citizenship increases in complexity. As the task of citizenship increases in complexity, then citizenship education becomes more problematic and challenging. There are a lot of factors affecting the growing complexity of citizenship. Some were mentioned here this morning: changing family patterns, increasing social mobility, the mass media, the whole information explosion. Big government is certainly another. American citizens are increasingly becoming consumers of government services at all levels -- local, state, and national. I think the growth of government is most noticeable at the national level, but it is occurring at all levels.

Let me give you some examples. While our nation's population has multiplied 53 times in the last 185 years of our history, the number of federal government workers has multiplied 1500 times. A year's spending by the federal government in George Washington's first term would only pay for about seven minutes of federal expenditures today and that's with inflation coverage. In spending last year an amount equal to almost one quarter of the country's total output of goods and services, federal government workers wrote about 772 million checks.

These are some interesting illustrations that indicate that government is indeed growing. And as government grown at all levels, the task of citizenship becomes more difficult. Take the task of decision-making, for example. Acting as consumers, citizens in the 1790's didn't have to face nearly the range of complexity of decisions that their contemporaries face today. Not only must a citizen today decide which auto loan terms are better, but the citizen must also decide whether to buy a small car in support of the President's energy policy and national program, or whether to buy a larger car. The citizen must decide not only whether to purchase saccharin, but also whether decisions by the Food and Drug Administration -- whatever that is or whoever those people are -- limiting the use of saccharin because of supposed cancer risks, really apply in their situations, or whether the Food and Drug Administration is right in the first place. Citizens who buy a lemon must not only cope with the task of dealing with the dealer who sold them the lemon; but in all likelihood they are going to become embroiled in dealing with both local and state government consumer protection agencies.

I think the point is obvious. The government is increasingly intruding in our lives. I'm not making a normative statement whether that is good or

bad; I'm trying to make an empirical statement that it, indeed, is making it increasingly difficult to be a citizen today. I think we see lots of indications of this. Why are we hearing so much about alienation and cynicism? I think it has a lot to do with the fact that people are having problems coping with big government at all levels.

7. New approaches to citizenship education should recognize that citizen education involves complex processes of human development.

The seventh criterion that I want to suggest to you as you develop new programs and approaches is that these approaches should recognize that citizen education involves complex processes of human development in learning. Again, I am not telling you something that you don't know; I am trying to emphasize something that you already know but should keep in mind. Let me suggest four facets of this that I think are important.

One is early learning. Quite simply, the process of becoming a citizen doesn't start in ninth-grade civics. It starts much earlier in life. Certainly from your point of view it starts in kindergarten. I'm not going to suggest that therefore we need a citizenship education slot in the kindergarten curriculum, but we do need to work at the elementary school level as well as at the high school level. It's harder to work at the elementary school level because those folks aren't like us. I mean, it's like working with a foreign culture. They are different, they are little, they are in a different stage of cognitive and moral development. They think differently, they have different interests, and so on. It is much easier to work with programs for high school students, who are really sort of younger college students, and anyway, they are much more familiar to us. I would suggest to you that a real challenge is to try to work at the early level because learning begins early.

The second point is, from what research tells us, learning is continuous and cumulative. Quite simply, political learning builds on itself. So what we have at grade 5 and 7 and grade 11 is a base for what we learn later and how we behave later. Now political socialization researchers have had quite a time trying to draw direct linkages; so they have gone out and surveyed kids' attitudes at the sixth grade about the presidency. Then they tried to figure out how those attitudes link with adult attitudes toward the presidency. They found that there is no direct link, but that learning is indeed cumulative and does build on itself.

Third, there are several explanations about learning. I won't belabor this; I will only point out that Kohlberg and Piaget and other cognative development theorists represent one school of thought about how people learn and develop. People like Albert Bandura and other social learning theorists represent another whole school of thought. When you think about citizenship education programs in practical terms, when you are hiring consultants and so on, make sure you get several points of view represented because there is no one theory in human development which explains how people become citizens and how they become competent or incompetent.

Finally, there is global learning. What I want to point out here is that the process of developing as a citizen isn't confined solely to developing knowledge and attitudes about state politics, national politics and family politics. Just as in the Middle Ages, people were subjects of a local kingdom, a larger kingdom, and the Holy Roman Empire; so today we

are simultaneously citizens of the family, state, and nation, and in some sense, the globe. The typical American develops attitudes and some scattered bits of knowledge and information not just about local politics and how a bill becomes a law, but also about how nations negotiate with each other and about war, peace and imperialism. Global learning is, indeed, a part of citizen development.

8. New approaches to citizenship education should recognize that citizen education is not confined to schools.

My final criterion is that new approaches to citizenship education should recognize that the process is not confined to elementary and secondary schools. I think that most of us agree in our heads with this guideline, but in effect we do not act that way. As things stand, social studies education and social studies educators equate citizenship education with schools and with schooling. Within schools and schooling they think of citizenship education in terms of what is called the social studies curriculum, the particular sequence of courses in subject matter from grades K through 12. Over the years this focus on schools and schooling has come to set the boundaries for what are considered legitimate and normal professional activities within social studies. These boundaries are hardly ever questioned. Social studies educators never think about the implications and rarely think about their field in terms of other categories.

I would like to suggest that in addition to the schools, there are at least seven other agents or shaping forces in society that are affecting citizenship education. These are: government, business, labor, mass media, voluntary organizations, religious organizations, and primary groups.

Government agencies and institutions at the local, state, and national levels are involved in citizenship education. Someone mentioned earlier that one of the problems of local government, whether they like it or not, is that it needs to stimulate citizen participation in order to obtain certain types of federal funds. The U.S. military regularly conducts citiship education programs for thousands and thousands of young people who are inducted into the armed services. Citizenship education is being conducted by the government.

Both business and labor have a stake in citizenship education and try to educate citizens. Often we don't think of this. It is hard to think of examples because we haven't been looking for citizenship education in these places, but they do occur. If you talk with labor leaders or people who are in the labor movement, they are involved. The AFL-CIO has been involved in citizenship education for years and years and years. So has the Chamber of Commerce, as have a number of large corporations with programs both for their employees and, in certain situations, for young people.

Voluntary associations -- let me mention one very quickly. The League of Women Voters has been for years engaged in exemplary citizenship education programs.

Religious organizations -- weekly millions and millions of Americans and their children receive instructions with respect to moral judgment making and moral behavior in many ways related to citizenship, when they attend worship services.

Mass media, I think you are aware of as an agent affecting citizenship education. Primary groups also; certainly citizenship education occurs both in the family and amongst peers.

I think it is very important as you think about developing new approaches to citizenship education that you recognize that the process is not confined to the schools and schooling, that we know very little of what is going on outside, and that as a matter of fact, much of what goes on there may directly contradict what we are trying to do in the schools. I don't know what the solution to that is, but awareness is the first step in thinking about the solution.

In summary now, I have tried to suggest eight criteria as you go about your work: (1) use good materials if they exist; (2) strike a balance; (3) create programs that are personally meaningful; (4) focus on basic tasks; (5) don't forget the global dimensions; (6) recognize that citizenship is becoming increasingly complex; (7) use instructional variety; and (8) go beyond schools and schooling.

QUESTIONS TO CONSIDER

In conclusion, let me pose three questions for you to consider. The first is, what in fact are the real limits of formal education in altering the behavior of people as citizens? Rhetorically, we pay lip service to the proposition that schools cannot teach students everything. We appreciate that people bring to their citizen roles personalities that are shaped by the larger culture and such agents as I have talked about -- the family, the government, the mass media, and so on. Yet, I challenge you to show me one empirically based, reasonably precise model of just what it is the schools can and cannot contribute in citizenship education. We really don't know.

We do have some glimmers. It seems that schools are more effective in imparting knowledge than attitudes. Political socialization research seems to indicate that social studies programs, at least, have had very little effect on student attitudes, whereas they do have some effect under certain conditions in developing student knowledge.

We also do not know which institutions in society, whether they are the schools, the family or whatever, are the best "carriers" of which parts of citizenship education. I'm not suggesting that you find the answer to this question, but I am saying that it is a question which really makes a difference. I think that over the years the schools have attempted to take on increasing numbers of responsibilities. They have become responsible for all sorts of things that they were not originally responsible for. In some sense, maybe the time has come to try to reverse the trend, and say, Wait a minute. We can't do everything in the schools, but here is what we can do best because we are the institution in society that possesses a particular set of resources. Now we don't really possess a whole lot of resources -- this is just hypothetical -- to develop student's moral capabilities, although we possess some. But we do possess a lot more resources to develop students' knowledge, whereas we don't expect that many parents are that knowledgeable about the intricacies of the national government or about federal policies. We will handle that part of the students' education, but we can't handle some of these other things because we are just not suited to do that. In any case, I think that those are the implications to this kind of question.

The second question is, what would your role and activities look like if you redefined your interest in citizenship education to include educational activities related to each of the sectors involved in citizenship education today? Not just the schools, but the government, families,

mass media, voluntary organizations, business and labor. Let me suggest three very specific programmatic activities that are not to my knowledge being attended to by anyone in your position and in which I think Pennsylvania would have a chance to occupy a national leadership role.

One is the coordination and monitoring of citizenship education efforts involving the different sectors of society that I just mentioned. We know that fragmentation and duplication characterize citizenship education today. We know that people involved in school-based citizenship education really know very little about what is going on in the other sector of society. You could develop the expertise to provide leadership in the coordination of school and nonschool educational programs. As experts in school-based citizenship education with a very legitimate access to the schools, you could design programs which could coordinate more effectively learning activities within the schools with those in other sectors of society.

My second programmatic suggestion is research on citizenship education in nonschool settings. The call for more research can always be a real cop-out. We don't know what to do; so let's research the problem. However, really significant, long-term improvements in citizenship education are ultimately going to depend upon our expanding our research effort to the total process of citizenship education, not just to the segment that occurs in the schools. I would like to suggest very quickly two or three research questions. One, we need some contextual mapping. We

literally do not know what is going on. I challenge you to find anywhere in the literature of social studies education so much as a description of citizenship education programs in anything other than the schools. You can't find it because it isn't there. We have no idea what is going on. Second, we need research which evaluates the effectiveness of such programs. How effective is the League of Women Voters program? What can we learn from it? What might they be doing better? Third, we need to assess the relationship between efforts in school and those in nonschool settings. What interactive effects are there when a student becomes involved in one of the new YMCA programs that link one city with the rest of the world and when that student undergoes the experiences he is exposed to in school?

Finally, a third programmatic activity might be the development of adult education programs to build citizen competence. Why is it that we think we have to teach everybody everything about citizenship before they graduate from high school? To give you one example: We know that a significant number of people, at some time in their lives, are going to become involved with the local courts. They did something bad; or they did not do something bad but somebody thought they did. Now, I think there are a lot of good legal education programs around and I think they should be continued. But why do we think that a legal education program in the ninth grade is going to help some poor soul who is 35 years old and all of a sudden is arrested. First of all, anything you learned about the courts is going to be changed. Court structure has probably changed; the building is down here instead of over there, and so forth. Secondly, you have to have a very high [illegible] to have remembered most of what you learned about the specifics of how to

protect yourself in the legal system. I'm not dumping on the legal education programs. What I am saying is, there is a need for adult citizenship education. As society becomes increasingly complex, there is an increasing need for educating older citizens when they need the education. That is, there is no reason for me to learn a lot about the local court structure unless I need to learn. But when I need to learn, there should be a program available. Another example is, how to access health services. We need programs for senior citizens, teaching them as citizens how to get better access to a variety of state, local and federal health programs that are available. One can think of a number of topics like this. I would really hope that you would at least consider them as you think about developing new approaches in citizenship education.

One final question, do students have the same motivation to develop citizenship skills as they do to develop reading and writing skills? Peer pressure is enormous on kids. "Hey, he dan't read! He's a dummy." "Hey, he's in the bluebirds (instead of the redbirds) reading group." But are those peer pressures there for something called citizenship skills? "Hey, he can't make a decision." "He doesn't know anything about local government." I've never heard a kid say something like that.

What I'm suggesting is that if the answer to that question is, no, the motivation is different, then maybe we need to reorient some of our thinking. Maybe one of the big challenges in citizenship education today is to develop student motivation to learn, and if we develop the motivation, a lot of the learning will take care of itself. The kids will learn if they are motivated

to do so. So maybe some of our emphasis in citizenship education should be shifted to motivation.

Citizen education is a continuing challenge and over the years I think we have tended to give it some of our very best social thinkers. People like Plato, Aristotle, Locke, Rousseau, de Tocqueville, Jefferson, Dewey and others have thought very seriously about citizenship education. So I would suggest to you that you are in very good company as you work on new approaches to citizenship education in Pennsylvania. Good luck!

A discussion period followed Dr. Remy's address, with participants addressing themselves to many of the points which Dr. Remy had raised, but most especially to the motivational factors he mentioned. It was suggested that society itself must make clear that out of its own self-interest it values citizenship skills as much as reading and math skills.

Another participant suggested that sending students into the community to practice the skills they had been taught might serve to increase motivation. This comment in turn suggested some stumbling blocks to such a practice. Among these were:scheduling problems, students who criticize the organizational structure of the school or other institutions in the community, and community attitudes toward having students sit in on community meetings and operating sessions of local government. The question was also raised as to the purpose of citizen education; is it simply to transmit values of the past or is it to help new standards and values to evolve? And concurrently, what might happen if the values which emerge from the teaching of citizenship skills are not the values of the students' families and/or peers?

Possible answers to these questions included the suggestion that the schools might extend their citizenship education programs to the students' parents, presenting them in evening classes. Another suggestion was that schools should welcome community participation in the schools in order to break down the walls that exist between the school and the community. School facilities could be made available to the public. People might be more receptive to students in their midst if they had a more positive attitude about their relationship to the schools.

AFTERNOON SMALL GROUP SESSIONS

Following lunch the two small groups met again, this time to suggest strategies for developing a statewide effort in citizen education and to brainstorm tasks which might be involved.

The strategies which were suggested included the following:

1. Deal with the relationship of state to local districts by
   a. allowing a wide latitude of choice among objectives, values, and other aspects of a citizen education program.
   b. agreeing on common basic documents to be studied in citizen education programs
   c. urging that some directions be followed which are considered more common and more important and leaving other directions open to local option
   d. mandating a general statement concerning citizen education and allowing the local districts to fill in the specifics.

2. Enlarge the membership of the state citizen education committee to include representatives from other sectors of the community, such as business, labor, voluntary organizations, and various racial/ethnic interest groups.
3. Integrate the citizen education effort with the back to basics trend but be careful not to tie it to any current fads; rather allow it to build a case on its own merits.
4. Involve all segments of the community in all committee efforts from conceptualization to implementation.
5. Initiate research into those resources in the community available for or engaged in citizen education.
6. Enlist state legislators in the citizen education effort by helping them to identify their role, providing them with information and lobbying for their support of citizen education.

The tasks that were brainstormed covered a wide and varied range of activity. Some of these tasks were:

1. Build a framework of what constitutes citizen education knowledge, skills and dispositions.
2. Develop a definition of citizen education for Pennsylvania that is based on input from a broad selection of participants and that encompasses the concerns of those participants. (Local districts could then select from that definition those parts that address local concerns.)

3. Hold a statewide conference involving persons in labor, business, and other sectors as well as educators to show what is now going on in citizen education.
4. Develop pre- and in-service teacher training programs in citizen education.
5. Hold public hearings on citizen education.
6. Create a student group similar to the FFA called Future Politicians of America.
7. Notify related legislative and other groups about the work of the state citizen education committee.
8. Obtain a source of financial support for the work of the state citizen education committee.
9. Create a Joint Council for Citizen Education outside of the State Department of Education.
10. Develop a long-range plan to include the relationship of citizen education to other areas of the curriculum, the evaluation of outcomes of planned tasks, etc.

CLOSING REMARKS AND DISCUSSION

A brief commentary on the report of the two small group sessions was offered by Robert Schell and by Barbara Presseisen, Director of the Citizen Education component at RBS. Dr. Schell noted that in both of the small groups there had been great emphasis on the balance needed in new approaches to citizen education, a balance between cognitive and affective approaches as well as a balance among approaches directed to developing knowledge,

skills, and attitudes. Dr. Presseisen noted that there is a need for a guiding group in citizen education which would represent the official education establishment in Pennsylvania but which would also go beyond education and reach out into many areas of the community. Such a group would need a long-range plan, but there are communications tasks in which it could start to engage at once through conferences, public hearings, surveys and other studies.

Dr. Manchester then delivered some closing remarks, responding to issues raised by the small group reports and the commentaries on them. His remarks follow:

I think Bob Schell's idea was that we should get people together representing the various educational organizations in the state to get some sense of how you feel you might participate in the process of dealing with citizenship education in the Commonwealth. I have gotten some sense of what you are concerned about. I think, however, you cannot operate as if you exist in isolation. All projects of this kind in the Department now are being plugged into the combination effort of the State Board and Project 81. It's a two-way flow. Project 81 and the staff of the 12 model districts do not exist in isolation from the Department. They have to listen to, and be cognizant of, all the projects that are going on. We hope that the soon to be gotten off the ground citizenship project, along with other programs that either have been ongoing or have started recently, will deal with what educational programs in the state should look like. On the other hand, it seems to me that a group like this needs to draw from what Project 81 has been able to do and will be doing over the next few months. I noticed

that you talked about interviewing a whole lot of people. Project 81 coordinators and staff have spent the last year interviewing, in groups and individually, literally hundreds of thousands of citizens within the cities of Pittsburgh, Philadelphia, Erie and Lancaster; in a number of Bucks County districts, Upper Merion and other suburban districts; and in a number of rural districts. These interviews asked citizens of all backgrounds what they wanted the schools to do in citizenship education and what were their major areas of concern. What comes out of that will be a goal statement and a set of competencies which will in fact provide the framework for the next couple of years in terms of what we will be doing in this critical area of citizenship education.

What I would like to see this group do is to provide some input to that goal statement and the competency statements which will be put into their final form in the next seven to eight months. And then, I would like you to make suggestions as to what the state can do in terms of its present program or in changing that program in order to deliver on that goal and those suggested competencies. In fact, I would like you to say from your own backgrounds how well we are doing and what does the state need to do, not to mandate, but to provide leadership in the area of citizenship education.

This morning I think I talked a little bit too much about the knowledge component. I feel equally strongly about the fact that the school exists as a community and teaches a lot to children outside of the social studies classroom, as well as within it. One of the areas that we are very interested

in is the discipline study, which started out as the student rights and responsibilities study some three or four years ago. It seems to me that there we have some golden opportunities to reach children in ways they are not being reached in the adult world. It is my feeling that the adult criminal justice system and the juvenile justice system in a sense are not working very well. The same problems exist right now in the school justice system. In the adult world the person is paroled time and time again. In the schools the parallel situation is that the student is suspended over and over again. The same kinds of alternatives that the judges are looking for to handle the seriously criminal or the seriously destructive person are simply not in existence. In both sectors there are the same problems, the same concerns, the same lack of even-handedness and fairness. It does seem to me that the schools, which up to this point have been able to control their own discipline situations, could set up a system which perhaps the adult world could use as a model; a system in which we could administer justice fairly, where there could be alternatives for the students, where justice could be both fair and firm, and where rights could be recognized but responsibilities also enforced.

One of the proposals that I made to the superintendents was that we address the whole question of the way kids feel about public property. We might do this by having as part of the high school experience the requirement that they participate, at least for a portion of their time, in the care of public property -- school facilities, the school building, or some other public property. I have had experience, and maybe some of you have also,

in schools where there wasn't enough money for custodial service for them. I was told that in Philadelphia during the custodial strike at the beginning of this school year that most of those buildings were better kept during the strike than they were when the janitors were there, simply because students and their parents pitched in and worked.

We haven't tapped that kind of citizenship responsibility in our school efforts for a whole variety of reasons, but it seems to me that a citizens' group of this kind could begin to point the way not only to a stronger knowledge component being offered in the schools, but also might address the whole question of how the school operates as a community and as a model, a learning experience for our students. I would hope that this group would get excited about doing that.

One of the things that I will be looking for is that with each of the eleven goals of quality education that the State Board is determining, there will be some leadership effort on the part of the state to deal with each particular issue. With each one of these goals, I hope that we will have groups comparable to this as we begin to generate some leadership on the part of the state to improve instruction.

APPENDIX 5

PROCEEDINGS OF THE NEW JERSEY
CITIZEN EDUCATION CONFERENCE

PROCEEDINGS OF THE NEW JERSEY CITIZEN EDUCATION CONFERENCE

Princeton, New Jersey

April 26, 1978

Research for Better Schools, Inc.
1700 Market Street/Suite 1700
Philadelphia, PA 19103

OVERVIEW

The Citizen Education component of Research for Better Schools, Inc. (RBS) is developing a partnership with the statewide school improvement programs in the tri-state area of Delaware, New Jersey and Pennsylvania. The purpose of the partnership is to develop and implement citizen education programs in the three states that will enable students to become more effective participants in democratic society. One of the first joint efforts of RBS and the State Department of Education in New Jersey was a workshop entitled "Toward the 21st Century: A Workshop on Citizen Education." The workshop was convened by Frank Falconieri, chairperson of the New Jersey Citizen Education Planning Committee, and was held on April 26, 1978, in Princeton, New Jersey. In attendance were members of the New Jersey State Department of Education, members of the Citizen Education component of RBS, representatives from other educational and public service organizations, and representatives from industry and community groups in the state.

The objectives of the workshop were:

- To explore the need for and the possible scope of citizen education;
- To develop tentative objectives for citizen education;
- To explore the interest in establishing a statewide commitment to citizen education; and
- To generate ideas concerning procedures for the creation of a statewide citizen education effort.

Through intensive work in the small group sessions, the objectives of the workshop were met successfully. Those persons attending expressed a consensus

as to the need for citizen education in the state of New Jersey and a commitment to working toward meeting that need. A list of objectives for citizen education in New Jersey was formulated and a number of ideas for bringing about a citizen education effort throughout the state were generated.

In the pages that follow are a transcription of the addresses presented at the workshop (slightly edited for the printed page), a report on the work done in each of the two small group sessions, and a report of the summation presented at the end of the workshop.

WELCOME TO PARTICIPANTS

The participants in the workshop were welcomed by Frank Falconieri, chairperson of the New Jersey Citizen Education Planning Committee and Assistant Director of the Office of Planning Services for the New Jersey Department of Education. The text of Dr. Falconieri's remarks is given below.

Welcome to the first of what we hope will be a series of state workshops dealing with a range of categories and topics in citizenship education. Today's workshop has been structured to bring together persons from many groups in New Jersey, including industry, private and public agencies, and advocacy groups, to talk about citizen education. We hope that you will be able to give some direction to the State Department of Education and the State Board of Education on citizenship and the responsibilities of citizenship and citizenship education.

Although many of us feel that we probably know what citizen education is all about -- we all had civics courses in high school and have participated in various kinds of community activities -- in reality the topic is not easily understood or easily fathomed. Citizenship education has been thought of by some as political in nature or as legal in nature by others. Lately it has taken on some environmental qualities, and some advocacy and equity qualities as well.

Actually we are not quite sure what citizen education is supposed to be, but we do know it is an important topic. We also know that we need to tap the resources of New Jersey -- the resources of our citizens and the resources of our decision-makers. That is why we have asked you to come and be with us this morning.

One of today's activities will be to develop some major goals for citizen education in New Jersey. We also want to set the stage for a working task force that can help us put together a five-year master plan for citizen education in this state. So by the end of today we should all have a good sense of where we are now and where we are going in citizen education.

Dr. Falconieri then introduced Fred Burke, Commissioner of Education for New Jersey, who spoke concerning the need for citizen education and what the nature of a program in citizen education might be. Dr. Burke's address follows.

Your concern today -- citizenship education -- is one that is personally very close to me, one which I may not be able to be really objective about. My background is in political science and I have taught in that field in this country and abroad for many years. I was also involved in government from a political point of view in Rhode Island and in New Jersey. Often over these years I have reflected about the nature of civic order and about what citizenship means.

The authority of the state is enormous. But recently we have seen that authority taken in rebel hands in country after country. In many areas we have seen a breakdown of civic order, of the willingness to obey. Now obviously, civic order is not dependent solely on force. It can't be. There isn't enough force -- there aren't enough machine guns -- available. By and large, the exercise of the state's authority is with consent. And it is a consent built upon understanding rather than on fear. In other words, you stop at a red light not solely or primarily because you know you will be arrested or

otherwise punished. You stop because you realize that if you don't, that if nobody stops at a red light, then you and other people might be killed.

Underlying that understanding is a kind of human cohesion which is terribly important. We say to ourselves "There but for the grace of God -- or Allah or Buddha -- go I." Therefore, it is not only that I might get killed if I go through the red light, but that someone else might get killed. This sense of the brotherhood of all humanity, however, is not genetically innate; rather, it is culturally acquired. I say this because of some experiences I had in Africa.

Many years ago in Uganda I spent some time with a certain small tribe. The members are wonderful people who have deep sense of obligation to all tribal members, but they do not have any sense of obligation to anyone who is not a member of their tribe. Therefore, if a fellow tribesman is hurt or in some kind of trouble, they have compassion to the point of sacrificing their own lives. I have seen them do this. But on the other hand, if the person is not a member of their tribe, they might find his discomfort amusing.

I was with a member of this small tribe once when we heard someone crying in pain in the deep grass. We stopped and at first I was almost ill. The man had been speared and was bleeding badly. I thought my reaction was natural for anyone, and it is true that my companion was also terribly alarmed -- until he found out that the man was not a member of this tribe. Then he was amused, literally amused, at the man's plight.

Other experiences that I have had, and my reading in philosophy and poetry for that matter, have further convinced me that this sense of obligation to other people is not innate; that it is something that must be learned.

Furthermore, I am convinced that this sense is the very basis of civic order and I am concerned that there seems to be evidence indicating that this fragile sense of obligation to others is breaking down.

It is not breaking down only in the way which conservatives might point out: the crime in the streets or the tendency for persons to identify with gangs or other groups to whom they feel more responsibility than to society as a whole. It is also breaking down in the area of public service: the willingness of people like Agnew or Nixon to say that everyone is in public service for themselves, therefore it is my right to milk it for what I can get out of it. That may work temporarily, but it doesn't work very long because the whole structure will fall apart.

Further evidence of the breakdown of this sense of human cohesion may be found in election results. You might expect that the way people vote would reflect their belief in the brotherhood of humanity, their desire to do what is in the best interest of all. But it doesn't work out that way any more. In local elections referendums to raise funds to build schools are defeated. We have schools in New Jersey which are on double and even triple sessions because of this. In other elections it has been demonstrated that you cannot pass any bond issue when senior citizens oppose it. You can't get the state legislature to put money into the cities. And it is very difficult now to get an educational budget passed at either the state or the local level.

This breakdown of human cohesion is a breakdown of what I call the civic order. It is a spiraling kind of thing that feeds on itself, and I don't think that education as it is today will turn that spiral around. In fact, I am convinced that the spiral will not be turned around without fundamental changes in education. And because we are educators, we have a responsibility on our hands.

I recall a book that I read many years ago, an early Freudian interpretation of what happens to civilizations and societies. It contrasted the evolution of the fascist society in Germany with the evolution of a relatively democratic society in England. The author began his study with the early nineteenth century when there were relatively comparable political, social, and communal institutions in both societies. Then he identified a small happening that became an irritant which changed German society. As a result the family structure became relatively authoritarian; then the schools became authoritarian; and then the political structure became authoritarian. He indicated that this spiral led inevitably to a facist, chauvinist antidemocratic society in Germany.

The author then identified a different small happening in history that became an irritant in English society. That too led to a change in the family structure, to greater promiscuity and more children. It also led to more freedom in the schools, more freedom to teachers, and to more freedom in the universities. Finally, the political system became increasingly democratic and has been perpetuated that way.

The specific irritants which were mentioned are unimportant today and I don't know that I accept the irritants theory. But I do think that the trends which move society in a certain direction tend to feed on themselves, in the way the author outlined, building up a mementum that is very difficult to cope with or reverse. One of our problems is that the momentum affecting our society is already on a rather rapid downward spiral. We have got to find a way to build into our educational system an irritant that will begin to turn this spiral around. Then hopefully there will be an upward turn. It is clear

we are not going to do this alone. But on the other hand, I don't think it is going to happen without us.

It is amazing, when there is a surplus of resources around, how magnanimous we all are. We are prepared to say, "Sure we can change. We can do more for the blacks." You say, "What is it going to cost me?" And we say, "It will cost you nothing because there is a surplus of resources." So I say, "Fine, I want to do everything I can. I love children. I want you to spend that money; I want you to use those resources."

But in an era where the resources are clearly finite, the only way to distribute those resources is to redistribute them. And that means that some people have to give up some of what they now hold. At that point we have to redefine and develop powerful arguments and strategies to maintain the status quo. I think we are at that point now. We are entering a postindustrial era which tends to bring out the worst in people. We begin to see some of the social gains of the 50's and 60's being threatened. For example, our concern now is not so much desegregation in our schools as it is resegregation.

In many ways we are fighting a holding action. We are trying to distribute the resources that are available to the cities and trying to provide the cohesive glue so we don't fly apart into tribal clusters. But no one wants to pay for that glue because it has to come out of someone's hide. Many people don't want to. They are more inclined to take the resources and use them to build defensive mechanisms such as police forces and structures that tend to hide reality from people who are not well-educated.

Now, let me sum up. The civic order, which is based on a sense of human cohesion, is in a downward spiral, heading toward a breakdown. This sense of

cohesion of the brotherhood of all humanity, however, is learned and it is learned through education. Therefore, education must be changed so that this value is taught.

At this point I would like to consider what is the meaning of education. I think that everyone involved in education has an obligation to deal with this question.

To me, education is a quest for human dignity. This may be an egotistical thought, but there is something about the nature of man that is unique and unusual. Unlike any other creature, man has dignity. By that, I mean each person is unique. There is no other existing organism exactly like any one person and each individual occupies a special place in the universe. It is a place that no one else occupies. That fact attaches extraordinary worth to that person. Education to me is a process wherein we help the individual to first identify his or her own worth, his or her own sense of uniqueness and pride, which I sum up as dignity. And in that process, or course, one then comes to appreciate the value and worth and dignity of others. You can't really have respect for other people unless you feel some respect for yourself.

Now that is what education is all about and to me that is what citizen education is all about. It begins with self and is an ascending process wherein your sense of self-worth and self-value leads you to respect and appreciate the dignity and the worth and the uniqueness of others not only in your group but also in groups outside your own.

It is as if we are all members of small tribes and it is imperative that education somehow or another indicate to us that we are also part of

a larger universe. Education must help us to develop a sense of dignity that transcends our small tribal unit; otherwise we will not survive. This is why I perceive of citizenship education, not only as the traditional learning of one's obligations within the more orthodox but readily perceived political structure of one's country, but also as the perceiving of one's sense of obligation as a human being to an interdependent world. If one reads the words of Christ or Mohammed or Buddha or Moses, it is all there. It is all the same thing. It is the Golden Rule and somehow or another we have got to find a way to incorporate this message into the education of children.

And if there is anything to my analysis that there is a spiral moving in a downward direction, then we have got to find the kind of irritant to turn that spiral around and stop its downward movement. I think the conference that is scheduled here today, the "Moving Toward the Twenty-first Century Workshop on Citizen Education" is the beginning of that kind of irritant here in New Jersey. So I want to wish you well for what I think is a terribly important meeting.

RBS GOALS VIS A VIS NEW JERSEY

Barbara Presseisen, Director of the Citizen Education component of Research for Better Schools (RBS) spoke to the workshop participants concerning the role of RBS in New Jersey's citizen education efforts.

The text of Dr. Presseisen's remarks follows:

Our combined task today is a welcomed one. Research for Better Schools, the laboratory Dr. Burke referred to and formally welcomed to New Jersey, is pleased to join the New Jersey Department of Education in sponsoring this meeting. I thank Dr. Burke for his cooperation and for the opportunity to meet with you.

When I called the Nassau Inn to make arrangements for this conference, the woman at the sales office asked what corporation I represented. I said Research for Better Schools. She replied that we certainly need a lot of that.

I am sure you know about the New Jersey Department of Education. Perhaps you are wondering about the work of Research for Better Schools. It is my responsibility to tell you about our laboratory. I am Barbara Presseisen, the Director of the Citizen Education component at RBS. I would like to tell you how our laboratory is going to work in partnership with the State of New Jersey in the area of citizen education.

RBS is one of 17 nonprofit research development laboratories and centers spread across the United States. Its history goes back to

the mid-1960's. RBS began its research in curriculum development areas and now engages in various activities of technical assistance, primarily in the region of New Jersey, Delaware and Pennsylvania. We have worked with schools. We have developed materials. We have trained teachers and administrators. We have worked on various kinds of educational research, evaluation, and dissemination in these three states, as well as in many places across the country.

Our basic funding is primarily from the federal government. In our work today, the National Institute of Education is funding this conference through a grant in the area of citizen education.

Our major mission is to work with New Jersey, Pennsylvania and Delaware in implementing their own state improvement programs. We need you to be proactive as taxpayers, citizens, and members of the organizations you represent in the state of New Jersey. Through Frank's work and the efforts of the New Jersey Department of Education, we are trying to find out what you want to take place in the schools. Then it is our job to help deliver such a program in terms of responsible education research and development principles. In many ways we are just beginning to scratch the surface of that work.

Some of the things that Dr. Burke mentioned are really pedagogical or psychological questions. How, in fact, do children learn values? How do they become eager participants, in a positive way, in society? A little later this morning we will hear Dr. Irving Sigel, an expert in child development, discuss some of the value formations that we are con-

sidering. But these are really difficult questions and there are many difficult questions to sort out, in terms of deciding what a program like this is going to do and how we are going to do it.

Our citizen education program at RBS began in December of last year. We are just completing the first preliminary research activities in our workscope. RBS believes that we must have a knowledge base at our command, at least in terms of what is known and what kinds of information are available on the development of citizenship. There are eight members of our staff who work in various ways on this knowledge base of citizen education. They collect and produce a variety of materials that we think is important to our potential clients, the people with whom we work in the three states.

We have been tracing the history of citizen education and we have found, through a conference of some of the most outstanding American scholars in that field, that various historical periods have each redefined citizenship.

Whether it was patriotism or Americanization or the melting pot theory that guided these various historical periods, they have had different visualizations of what schools or societies should be doing in the area of citizen education. RBS will soon publish these historical papers as part of our knowledge-building activity.

We have also developed a working definition of citizen education, which you will find in your folder. We raise questions not only about what citizen education is, but also about what are its component parts,

and how are they manifest in real performance. There are many who say citizenship means everything to everyone. We feel we must not only define citizen education, but also determine what objectives such a definition must serve. Thus, we have completed a study of objectives in citizen education across the country, in terms of what people, state educational agencies, and various civic organizations have set as their goals for citizenship. One of our jobs today is to set some beginning goals in citizenship education for the state of New Jersey.

We have also looked at the historical basis of past citizen education efforts. RBS is engaged in the study of related instructional materials and has examined energy materials, environmental materials, global education materials, and law-related education materials. Teachers don't really have to make anything new. A world of products already exists. But to know about them, to know if any of them are any good or if they are effective with students is another question. Do they work? Do they teach? Do children like them? Do they meet the stated objectives? RBS is trying to answer those concerns.

We have been gathering information about measuring and assessing citizen education. Again, there are more questions than there are assured answers. Measuring a child's value system, finding out whether he or she is inclined one way or another in terms of a disposition or value, is a very difficult task. In conjunction with that, we have been looking at the variables of learning. What, in fact, and how, in fact, do you learn citizenship? What experiences help children learn?

What teaching strategies can we examine which seem to be the most promising for the goals we set?

We have also collected a compendium of information about organizations and people concerned with citizen development. We have researched the tri-state region we deal with and across the country as well. It is amazing again to learn how much material has been developed, how much energy is expended, and the sheer number of people who are working in this area. Through private organizations, through businesses, and through public agencies, there is an enormous effort concerned with what is citizenship or citizen development for children. Whether it is the YMCA or the Boy Scouts or some other organization, they all have that common concern. Very few of these agencies, however, are systematically studying the effects of their activities, at least not in terms of what really happens to youngsters involved in these experiences. We think that these effects need to be studied.

RBS has looked at the 50 states in terms of what is required in their curricula, in terms of mandated activities, and state programs. We have tried to get these disparate states to talk with one another.

What is known about values formation and the development of personal ethics? RBS has been interested in affective education for many years and many of the publications you will see outside are products of the kind of research we have conducted in that area. Citizen Education will incorporate that work, and we hope to advance it further in our new tasks.

We are also looking at what is happening in classrooms right now. Many of you saw a copy of the survey which New Jersey as well as Pennsylvania and Delaware have recently cooperated with us in conducting. We are now getting the responses about actual practices and activities in citizen education which are going on in elementary and secondary classrooms today. That information will help us plan future activities in the three states, as well as to build common goals with what already exists.

That is what we are about in terms of the basic knowledge we are trying to build at RBS. It is a foundation for the future program we hope to implement in the three states next year. We will become involved in actual teaching sites with real schools, real teachers, and real communities. The activities of research and development at those sites will be based on questions and concerns that the people in that community want to explore. Citizen Education must begin with what the people involved in that particular site want to do. By people we don't mean just the school community. We mean the whole community in which the school exists.

We hope to locate some other sources of funding for the site research. Programs like Title IV-C or other kinds of federal research can bring funds in for such special study, for personnel development and for technical assistance. That is what we see as our role, and that is what, at the moment, the NIE is willing to sponsor as a potential model for change in this important area.

There is one other aspect that is important and I mention it because it involves other people who are working with RBS. We have a state committee

in New Jersey, as we have state committees in Pennsylvania and Delaware. In these committees, people across the state with various interests and backgrounds are able to help shape policy and decision in the citizen education program for their state.

I think one of Frank's interests today is to identify people beyond the New Jersey Department of Education who want to be involved in such a committee or task force and have input into its work from a larger, statewide perspective.

To that group, RBS brings not only its abilities and professional skills, but also the resources of a technical resource panel whereby we are able to tap the talent of many experts across the country.

For example, if we find that a statistical measurement in our testing is very important to our research and it is different from the kind of measurement which is done elsewhere, we call on the best person we can find from our panel to bring their talents to bear on these important questions. We have that kind of capacity.

Just last week at the University of Pennsylvania, Dr. Burke participated in an ethnography colloquium that RBS sponsored with the graduate school faculty. Ethnography can be used as a research tool in actual teaching sites.

To study the larger community and the interactions of the many subgroups of a school, ethnography is an exciting possibility for educational research. A member of Penn's faculty, and possibly several graduate students, may be involved in the kind of ethnographic research we are planning.

This offers us a chance to tap talent even beyond the people in the traditional education research field.

The central question is what can be done in the field? Combining RBS' educational research expertise, the support of the New Jersey Department of Education, and the involvement of the local site -- its teachers, children, even the custodian who might be a very important person in the students' development -- what can we do in citizen education today? When we have examined this question in specific school sites, we hope to be able to disseminate the results of our study in a larger state program.

I want to mention some of the factors in our society that indicate the need for redefining citizen education. It is not that we have to find one definition that constantly works. But it seems in the American experience there are aspects that call for a redefinition of what, in fact, a citizen is. If we only bring Plato's dialogues up-to-date and say that it is not man that is the political animal, but humans, we shall have begun that redefinition.

There is the National Assessment of Educational Progress, whose testing results are available every three-year period. The 1976 results have been reported recently and they show, unfortunately, a decline in the very basic knowledge structure about government and the functions of government in our society. These are tests, somewhat like SAT's, that are given to 13-and 17-year-olds across the country. The results in this case are of the 13-year-olds, comparing the 1973 results with those of 1976.

One of the surprising findings that came out of the 1976 test was that fewer 13-year-olds selected freedom of religion as a right guranteed by the Constitution compared to their peers in 1973. In terms of the history of this country, that is a very uncomfortable fact to deal with and one that strikes me as a serious concern for citizen education.

Perhaps more disturbing is the NAEP finding that there was a loss, in terms of understanding of and willingness to participate in, the political process among 13-year-olds, comparing 1973 and 1976 results. Obviously, some messages are not getting through to these youngsters. This assessment shows some important aspects of citizenship need revitalizing, if not redefinition.

Interestingly enough, there were mixed successes in terms of the scores of students, 13-and 17-years old, in recognizing Constitutional rights. This occurred in the 1976 test, after Watergate and after Vietnam. Relative to the experience of the total society, it seems to say that the findings are difficult to understand, and the results need to be compared with future performance as well as analyzed in depth. That is true of all testing in this area.

Dr. Burke mentioned already that distrust of government officials, the corruption of politicians, disenchantment with the political process itself, are important factors to keep in mind when thinking about citizen education and young Americans. This is true when examining their own antisocial performance, as well.

RBS has completed several studies on violence in the schools and disciplinary problems in education. In my conversations with persons in the three states, this is one of the first topics to be raised as a concern in citizen education. We must examine and try to find out what are the causes of such violence, and how the structure of the educational institution, or even the influence of television, contributes to such a distorted view of citizenship.

Another factor that is difficult to deal with, yet one that affects the political and social activities of youngsters, is the role of changing patterns of American family life: single parent homes, working mothers, later marriages. How do these developments influence one's view of citizenship? Do they influence actual classroom experience or the interaction between the school and the social development of the young? We need to find out.

The general problem of withdrawal from social responsibility is also a concern for citizen education. The role of drugs, the irrational attraction of far-out religions to youth, and their view of terrorism, are all potential areas of study when we are in the field.

One of the things we did for this conference was to prepare a pre-survey of those who planned to attend, asking them what they wanted in citizen education. We could not really group you on the basis of your responses, as there were too few, but in terms of the responses returned it was interesting to note that the three areas of highest rating were the process areas, not the content dimensions. You wanted critical thinking,

problem solving, and inquiry skills to be the focus of citizenship. That may show that we are probably a rather biased group here today, and perhaps we will have to work on that, but it also shows we have a fairly cohesive view of what we think citizenship entails.

Let me take just a few moments to tell you about your role today. It was Frank's intention that this group should represent more than just the schools, more than the New Jersey Department of Education; it should be representative of the community at large. I think we have that today. We want to hear you and to have you exchange with other members of the conference. Consequently, we are going to break into small groups and move away from this podium for a good part of this morning and afternoon.

We hope to build an awareness of others' views. Part of our objective is that you become aware of the perspective of the other persons with whom you are talking today. We want to develop commitment for the activities that we can set together, especially the long-range goals that we can set for the state for the next five years. We hope the remaining program today will build toward these objectives.

Please enter into the process. How do we get someone to be proactive? I guess we will have to capture you intuitively and spontaneously. But your role today is really to be active and to talk to others, to those of us in the New Jersey Department of Education and to those of us at RBS, and to your fellow participants in the conference. Carry this dialogue beyond the Nassau Inn in Princeton, as rarefied an atmosphere as that is. We are here on vacation, in a way, to enjoy ourselves in being spontaneous and exchanging.

We all will go back, eventually, to the realities of New Jersey and this region. In terms of citizenship, let us expand our views and begin to redefine what citizen education means to us today.

MORNING SMALL GROUP SESSIONS

For this portion of the program, the workshop participants were divided into six working groups that were chaired by persons from RBS and the State Department of Education. The groups were led through two activities designed by Clarence Lynn, Curriculum Consultant at the Educational Improvement Center, South, to further the attainment of the workshop objectives.

The first activity was designed to help group members become acquainted with one another and to learn where each person was coming from in terms of their views about citizen education. Each member of the group was given a blank time line which they were asked to fill in by recording significant events in their own lives. The completed time line was then shared with the other members of the group.

The second activity was designed to help group members focus on what the future might bring forth in New Jersey in a number of areas related to citizen education, the rationale being that one can only plan for the future after one has considered what life in the future might be like. The participants were again given blank time lines, covering the period from 1980 to 2020, and the following list of areas of citizen education concern: demography, government policy, global impacts, energy use and impacts, economic trends, natural resources/environment, housing, technology, life styles, public services, legal developments, political participation, interpersonal and social relations, and morals and values. The group members were asked to select two or three of the areas they thought were most relevant to their own concerns and then to fill in their time lines with projections as to what might happen in these areas in New Jersey in the given time period.

These time lines of the future were then shared within each group. The predictions ranged from rather pessimistic to very optimistic in tone and covered many different areas. Some of these predictions are given below to indicate the variety of views of the future which were offered.

Demography. The decline in the birth rate will continue. This factor will lead to an increase in the number of elderly persons in the population. Because older persons have traditionally been one of the best organized groups in the country and have voted more faithfully than other age levels, there will be more citizen involvement in political affairs and citizens will have more leverage in government.

Economic trends. Economic growth will slow down. New Jersey will become one of the major postindustrial states, with people working in mega-corporations and with a much higher degree of technology.

Energy use and impacts. Instead of energy shortages, there will be energy storage shortages. The importing of fuel will almost cease; instead, we will develop viable fuel alternatives such as a solar microwave satellite which will require an area for storage about the size of Manhattan.

Life styles. Life-styles will become increasingly diverse with different generations holding quite different values.

Global impacts. Off-shore drilling and other energy developments will involve New Jersey in global politics to a much greater extent. The Middle East states will get together and arise as a superpower, as will China through the use of Japanese technology. New Jersey industries will become part of the multinational corporations which will form a global counsel to ensure world peace.

Public services. Because the population will be even more concentrated in urban areas than it is now, the demand for services will be greater. Lack of ability of local government to provide all needed services will lead to more demonstrations in the streets.

Morals and values. The future will be marked by a return to the civic values typical of the early 1900's in the United States. Conservatism in morals and in political and legal decisions will increase markedly.

CHILD DEVELOPMENT AND CONCERNS FOR CITIZEN EDUCATION

The guest speaker for the workshop was Irving E. Sigel, Director of the Center for Child Care Research at the Educational Testing Service, in Princeton, New Jersey. A nationally recognized authority in the area of child development, Dr. Sigel presented the workshop participants with a developmental perspective of how children learn and discussed the implications of that perspective for planning programs in citizen education. The text of Dr. Sigel's address in given below.

I want to start off with a very basic proposition which is not unique to children, but to all of us. The proposition is that we are products of our own history. When we face issues of citizenship education, they may all appear rational, but their rationality stems from our own personal belief system. Thus, when we try to decide, for example, what are the core values in the United States, we can all come up with rational statements of what a core value is. But when we try to list what those values might be, we find ourselves at opposite ends of a continuum. So the issue is one of becoming aware -- as policy makers, as educators, as investigators -- of what our own beliefs are.

We have discovered in some of our research that parents, for example, vary in how they believe children develop. One parent may believe that a four-year-old child is irrational, that he has no sense of reasoning, no sense of logic. He just does things on impulse without any control; therefore, the job of the adult is to tell him what to do, to keep him straight.

Another parent, however, will tell you that children have their own logic perspective. The adult's task, then, is to try to relate these two sets of differences, the perspective of the four-year old and the perspective of the adult.

Now, neither of these parents is irrational: neither of these parents is illogical. Their beliefs come from their experience and even from what they might read.

So the question, you see, becomes, what are our beliefs? This question enters the arena of citizen education in two ways.

One, it enters in terms of what the content of citizenship education should be, but I am not going to get into that. You have worked on that issue before, and you are going to work on it again. It is a constant issue. But it has to be resolved at some point.

But a second issue is what are our beliefs about doing anything about the content of citizen education. Obviously we have made one commitment; we are here, I gather, to deal with citizenship relative to education. This says that our State Department of Education has seen fit to embark on a citizen education program in the schools. And we hope that the citizens will make some decisions as to what the substance of this program should be.

But then there is another question that is related. That is, if we decide to go into the schools, how do we go about it? Because we could also say let's go into the homes. One could argue very cogently and rationally that many of the basic values of children, and of adults, have their origin in the home. In fact, if I were to take a psychoanalytic orientation toward development, I could argue, quite cogently and with data, that children de-

velop attitudes, feelings, and belief about the good -- and the origination toward the good in a societal sense -- from the way they experience their family.

Martin Hoffman in some of his work in the development of altruism or morality, argues that the way children develop a conventional perspective toward the moral order, or a humanistic orientation toward the moral order, or an external one, stems from their relationships with their parents. So one could opt for a program in parent education. But we have opted for a program in the schools, which expresses a belief on our part that the school is one agency which is going to function as a socialization agency in the arena of citizenship education.

Now, if you look at the schools, the schools are a community in and of themselves. They have all the trappings of government. There are people who give orders, and there are rules that are made, and there are people who enforce the rules.

I am not going to get into the debate about the bureaucracy of education or its line staff relationships or the democratic nature of school organization. There are experts who know more about that than I do. Everybody in this room is a product of the system and we all feel we are experts. Since everybody was a child and every parent was a child, obviously we know everything there is to know about parents and children. But the fact is that the school is an institution with its sense of mission and its responsibilities given to it by a community.

Now, this becomes a very critical feature because once we acknowledge the fact that the school has a certain kind of autonomy, but at the same

time a dependence on its boards of education and its public, then the issue of the content of citizenship education gets much more complicated.

Another complicating factor lies in the school's sense of mission. The given mission of our educational institutions is to educate children to assume their rightful responsibilities in our society. Therefore, the consumers of citizen education are the children. Yet the children are often not considered when the content of a program is being developed.

I am very impressed when reading materials on education. They deal with curriculum, with objectives, with the structure of social science, or with the structure of biology or mathematics. Somehow the only person that was left out of the discussion was the one that all this structure is set up for -- namely, the child. And I ask you, can you show me in the material that you have read any considerations there for the nature of the organism which is the target of all of this effort?

So the questions then are what are the institutional arrangements that become necessary for facilitating the mission that we set out for ourselves, and what consideration do we have to take in carrying out that mission.

Let's start by considering institutional arrangements. We have a Board of Education which has differential degrees of intrusiveness, depending on your community and what the hot issues are, and we have a school professional staff. We also have committees and subcommittees and all that bureaucracy, but when it comes right down to decision making, although decisions are made at every line, the decision really affecting our mission is made on the basis of what happens in a classroom between the teacher and a child.

The child, therefore, becomes one very central focus. But what do we know about children, and why are children relevant? They are relevant because we know enough today to say things about not only how children learn, but also what and in what form they can learn.

To start out then in this context, the child enters the school, obviously, with five years of history. For the most part schools ignore that history. They ignore what the child might already know. Let me illustrate that with an experience I remember vividly when my own son was six and in the first grade. It was the time of the first moon shot, and he was very excited because he saw it on TV. He told his first grade teacher about it and she said, "We can't talk about that now, we are still on dinosaurs."

Even though the moon shot was a momentous event in history, somehow it was irrelevant to the teacher. What was relevant that on Monday the class started with dinosaurs and this being Tuesday, they would go on with dinosaurs, because if they didn't, they wouldn't get to the end of the lessons by whatever the set date was.

Facetious as that incident may be, the irony of it has too much truth to it. The understanding of children as developing organisms has to regard the child as a continually developing creature who at age five doesn't suddenly become something unique and different. Just because the calendar date is December 1 doesn't make him different from what he was on November 30 or will be on December 2. Teachers and administrators and curriculum builders must see the child as a developing organism.

Another argument we present is that children do not grow up simply by adding bits and pieces of information. It is not just three words learned

at one age and five words at another and 10 at another and 20 at another. It is not an incremental process. This is a very important problem because if you believe in increments, you can just pile the books up, going from book one to book two, to book three and book four. The assumption is that the difference between the books is the number of words and pages. But actually it is a qualitive difference, and I will present some examples shortly.

We have the notion that children develop through stages which correspond somewhat to ages, and that the child starts out in early life as an active learner and he continues this way. He has the potential for continuing that way forever until the end reaches the child in all of us.

Now, it is very important to keep the stage concept in mind. It is a critical perspective in terms of the mind set of educators, because as we will see, the stage at which the child is at will define the kind of materials and problems and teaching strategies with which he can engage. A stage tells us that this is a period in the child's life which can be characterized by certain competencies and certain ways of performing.

The extent to which children at different stages of intellectual growth differ is considerable. For example, preschool and early elementary school children tend to believe what they see is real. In other words, the amount of inference is minimal and appearances take on a reality. Thus, if you ask young children about dreams, they sometimes have trouble telling you whether it was a dream or a real event. Or if you ask a young child about the moon, she will tell you, "Gee, that moon moves. It goes wherever I go."

Of course, even some adults will say, "You know the moon does go around the earth, because every time I move, it moves." But we won't get into the

degree to which adults all think at the most advanced level. We do know that children at different ages will handle the dream issue or the moon question differently, and it is not because they necessarily learn about the moon or that they learn about dreams. It is because there are certain internal changes that occur in the child's orientation as he moves from childhood up to adulthood.

The first three years of life I am not going to go into, except to point out that we know that infants think. Infants reason in their own unique way and infants can solve problems. In other words, the human infant is not a vegetable that suddenly, when he or she gets to be four or five, emerges from a cocoon and is then a miniature adult. This fact is very important because the prototypes of infants' reasoning and thinking strategies, which are there very early, become the foundation for what happens later.

For example, very young children have difficulty with one of the most central features of intellectual growth. That is the ability to anticipate and plan and the ability to use previous experience in the service of this planning.

Young children are more capable of dealing with past experiences than they are in predicting into the future. A young child can reconstruct an experience, not accurately but in his own way, but when it comes to predicting the outcome of something, he has difficulty.

This kind of example then says if you want to talk with five or six year olds about the consequence of a moral action or the consequence of any act, the probability is that "consequence" is too vague a concept. But it might be much more meaningful for him to deal with, if you asked him to re-

member what happened and why did it happen. In other words, you deal in something that he has been engaged in because much learning in the early years comes through involvement and engagement in action.

That concept is critical, because it says we should be dealing with the child as an active learner, an active participant. The task of education, then, is to take advantage of that activity. Instead, however, we tend to treat children as passive objects. We spend a lot of time telling them information and giving them explanations, but rarely do we check to see what they understand by these explanations. We are more concerned with the way they sit, the way they behave, that kind of thing.

Children can understand, however, rules for behavior and the rationale for those rules, if they are properly approached. What should be done, for example, is to allow the child to move around the room. If you begin to see that things are not working out well after a few minutes, get together with the child to discuss what has happened, why did he get into an argument with another child, for example.

Very often the argument is over sharing. Children are all little capitalists. They want all the equipment to be their own and if they possess it, they don't want to give it up to someone else. So you talk with the child about the whole problem of sharing and you get into discussions of rules that are generated out of this necessity. So the children learn after awhile. But they don't learn from the teacher admonishing them and saying, "You will now share and like it." Rather, they learn by discussing what the short-term implications are. By short-term, I mean like three seconds from now, not next week, because next week doesn't really exist for children of this age.

So the point is that the children generate the rule out of the engagement in that exercise. The rule is not an arbitrary statement presented by the teacher; rather, it comes about because each member of the group learns at the age of five, believe it or not, that there is a consequence to a nonrule situation. These children don't like anarchy, because anarchy means some people aren't getting any of the goodies. So they come up with a rule about sharing.

During this early period of the child's life, around age seven, the child does have the capability for reasoning, but in a very concrete way. Children can see relationships, but on a very simple level. They can deal with two things, relating two things together, but using only one attribute. For example, they can understand the commonality between an American Indian and an Eskimo. And this kind of combining and seeing relationships between things, provides one way for children to organize.

Very early in life children classify, but by age seven they are beginning to make these classifications in much more central ways. Knowing this fact offers a real implication for curriculum. It offers a way for the teacher to deal with the question of classification, relevant to certain issues that might be appropriate in various situations.

As the child becomes able to see relationships, a number of other things emerge. He is able to see not only size, but various kinds of quantities, so we have what is called serialization. Adults engage in this same activity. We use words like "more" or "less" very liberally. We have built-in classes that we are not always aware of. We see relationships which are very often stereotyped, so the process we use is no different. The difference lies in the quality of what the child can do.

As adults we can handle a complex classification problem and we can pick up at least three attributes. Let us say, we are talking about economic systems and we want to compare socialism with free enterprise with communism. Now, we can keep those three systems in our heads and begin to work with them, but the young child cannot do that. He can only deal with two items, and probably with one attribute of each.

During the period of roughly age seven to ten, the child is gradually able to increase the complexity of his classifications. The child can deal with classification at the age of seven in one way, but if you give him the same item at the age of ten, he will give you a new set of answers. In other words, there is a change in the quality of how he would respond. For example, the seven-year-old, when asked how are a cat and dog alike, would say, they have legs. By the time he gets to be 10 or 11, he would say, they are animals.

Now, these are both accurate answers. They are both classifications. However, one is dealing with appearance, what the child can see, and the other one is dealing with some differential statement.

These differences, as they emerge, continue up to the time that the child is in high school; at that age they can deal with subjects in a more formal logical propositional way. Notice that I didn't say "more rational," because one person's rationality is another person's irrationality. The issue is propositional logic, where the children can reason in what we would call logical terms.

It is also during adolescence that young people get committed to certain kinds of values, for reasons that are rational in the sense that they reasoned them out, and also for reasons arising from their disaffection with the status

quo. For example, they may say, what is so good about democracy?, or, why should we go to church?

These stages of development in children make a very central point to us as educators: if the child shows different classes of competence as he emerges, then it becomes critical to gauge the kinds of teaching, the kinds of material, the level of material in relation to his development.

But there is another point that I think is also central in the teaching itself, which is not something that is often stressed. This is the fact that the teacher is a model and I am not talking about the teacher as a paragon of virtue -- the moral person who doesn't cheat on his income tax or never goes through a red light. Rather, I am speaking of the teacher who is a model as an inquirer, and who can set that example for the child. Such a teacher uses question-asking strategies to engage the child and make her or him an active thinker. This point is critical because if the child is an active organism, we should utilize that fact in the process of problem solving.

If the child is engaged in patterns of thinking through inquiry, this provides the context that we want for citizen education. I believe that we are not talking about citizen education as a process of indoctrination. We don't want children to simply remember and repeat such things as the Pledge of Allegiance. We want them to comprehend what they are doing and saying.

Thus, I argue for teaching strategies that engage the child through active inquiry, because inquiry forces one to examine the experiences that one has had, to anticipate what may be the outcome of a given action, and to put these things together so that one can reflect on where one is coming from and reach an understanding of where one is at the present. If the en-

gagement and the teaching strategy is such that it creates an orientation to and the habits of problem-solving, then the probability of this strategy transcending the classroom should be pretty good. This too is important because citizen education is concerned with the behavior of children not only in the school but outside of school as well.

In summation, the issue finally resolves itself to a commitment to a developmental perspective that children are active learners; they are out to gather data and to use the data to come to decisions. The task of the teacher in the classroom is to employ that natural orientation of the child and to provide the environment which allows it to flower, because children learn from their own mistakes. One way a child develops a kind of strategy is through his own errors.

In other words, we are dealing with a changing child in a changing world and the task for educators is to be able to roll with the punches. If we can take that kind of perspective, I think then we are in a position to begin to fill in the big issue -- which is, what the contents of citizen education should be.

AFTERNOON SMALL GROUP SESSIONS

In the second small group session, group members were asked to formulate a statement of what they thought should be the goals of citizen education for New Jersey. To facilitate this task, all persons in each group were asked first to list on separate cards five outcomes of citizen education which they considered important. The cards from all members of the group were combined and displayed. Each person in the group was then asked to select from the total cards the two outcomes they perceived to be most important. The outcomes that were selected showed a wide range of concerns; included were some that dealt with knowledge, some that referred to attitudes, and others that focused on skills. A representative sample of outcomes chosen as most important by members of the various groups are given below.

As a result of citizen education, students should:

- Have an understanding of the Constitution and the Bill of Rights as the basis of their sense of themselves as citizens
- Have the skills to analyze critically issues that affect the social reality they confront
- Be aware of the economic and ecological systems in the United States and know how their use or misuse can affect not only the students' lives but also the lives of everyone in the nation
- Recognize that there is a shortage of fossil energy which must be replaced by man-made energy devices
- Be able to evaluate the influence of mass media
- Be able to understand and evaluate technology

- Have the skills needed to communicate with others to form common social goals
- Be able to deal humanistically with others
- Be able to assess their own behavior and to select alternative behaviors if they find they are not achieving success
- Have a strong sense of self-respect that would be the basis of a sense of respect and responsibility for their community.
- Accept different cultures and recognize that "different" isn't synonymous with "bad"
- Be aware of global issues and the impact of these issues on their own lives and the lives of others
- Be able to apply critical thinking processes to the problems of public service
- Be able to generate innovative alternative solutions to new social/economic problems as they arise
- Be active participants in the political process
- Have the skills necessary to obtain government services and to make their voices heard by the government
- Be able to form a community of their peers and to regenerate a sense of community in American society
- Be prepared to live as citizens of a complex and interdependent world
- Be able to make their own decisions concerning issues that arise in their daily lives
- Be able to reason at higher moral/ethical levels

The outcomes chosen by group members as most important were then discussed by the group as a whole. The purpose of the discussion was to develop a goal statement for citizen education in New Jersey that would incorporate the elements of the chosen outcomes. The goal statements which resulted were:

The goal of citizen education in New Jersey should be:

- To train teachers to teach critical thinking, problem solving, and moral/ethical reasoning.
- To develop critical thinking about societal problems (e.g., energy, technology, racial-ethnic intolerance) and to acknowledge the necessity for pluralistic involvement (e.g., community, students, labor, parents, business) and the alternative ways that might be taken to achieve such involvement, never losing sight of the individual's role in human rights.
- To help students to acquire skills, knowledge, and values that will enable them to effectively participate and function as citizens in a globally interdependent future.
- To develop in students a personal awareness of another's need and the disposition to do something in response to that need.

These goal statements were then presented and explained to the entire workshop by the leader of each group.

COMMENTARY AND CLOSING REMARKS

Following the presentation of the goal statements by the group leaders, Russell A. Hill, Senior Research Fellow in the Citizen Education component at RBS, offered some observations on what had been accomplished at the workshop and its implications for the future. Dr. Hill's remarks are given below.

I would first like to offer an observation on the process of developing objectives in citizen education. There is a mythology about the process that I think hurts the whole citizen education movement. The myth is that you can't really get any agreement on objectives in this area; that every time you start to discuss the subject, you wind up with conflict and disagreement.

I have watched this process repeatedly, here and in other places. I have found that there is often wide agreement among persons representing different groups. There may be a language problem because different groups use different languages--the language of education or the language of business, for example -- but that is a problem that can be thrashed out. Once the individuals who are working together come to understand one another's language, then you begin to see an agreement develop as to what the objectives of citizen education should be. That is what has happened here today. As you can see by looking at the goal statements from our small groups, there is agreement. Although we might want to expand some of the statements or perhaps argue about the level of generality of others, I think that there is much in each statement that we can all agree with and subscribe to.

So the myth that agreement about citizen education objectives is impossible to obtain is just that -- a myth. Because this myth tends to retard efforts in the area of citizen education, we must overcome it. I don't know how you do that -- perhaps by involving everyone in the State in the process -- but we must find a way to debunk this myth and to keep it from spreading.

My second observation concerns the quality of the discussion today. I think that all of you here today have displayed a degree of knowledge about and a sense of commitment to citizen education that is most impressive. I have done a lot of reading and thinking in the area of citizen education, but I have gotten some new ideas today. I have been enlarged by the discussions, both formal and informal. And I think most of you would say the same. What I am trying to say is that although we are a small group, we are potentially mighty. And I think that is a very positive point.

Another positive aspect of today's efforts is the leadership statement that was made by Dr. Burke. I don't think there is any question about his enthusiasm for our effort and his personal commitment to citizen education. When you have that kind of leadership, it provides a firm basis for further constructive action.

My final observation, which I also see as positive, concerns the negativism that seems to pervade the younger people here today. That may sound like a contradiction, so let me explain. I remember a former teacher of mine talking about the way you get people to change. He called the process "conversion" and said that the key to that process is first convincing people that there is real sin. So if in our citizen education effort, we are to

focus on only one aspect initially, it might be on the task of convincing people in New Jersey and in our society at large that there are problems confronting them as citizens. I have been impressed with what the small groups have done today in identifying the problems that now confront and that will confront the people of New Jersey. The future projections identified problems that seem very real and very serious -- overwhelming in many cases. But now that we have identified these problems, I think I have enough belief in the positive nature of people to think that we will all say, "We had better get together and do something about these problems."

The question is, what will we do? As a member of the RBS staff, I would first like to talk briefly about RBS's role in future efforts. RBS's job is to stimulate discussion about citizen education at the state and local level, offer as much research and development support for the state and local efforts as we can with our limited resources, and to facilitate the development and implementation of citizen education models in the state. The real brunt of the citizen education effort, however, will be borne by your state citizen education committee. This committee will be doing the planning and carrying out the program in New Jersey and they need your support. I hope you will give it to them. I hope you will act through the organizations you represent. And I hope you will be ready to attend other meetings and help us all move toward an effective citizen education program for the State of New Jersey.

Dr. Falconieri then offered some brief closing remarks.

I feel that part of the real job to create consciousness about the need for citizen education in New Jersey has already begun. If we can forge a working task force from the people who have participated in this workshop today, I think we can produce the kind of citizen education goals and materials that New Jersey requires. I agree with Russ that Commissioner Burke's enthusiasm for citizen education was self-evident. As he said this effort taps some of his own life experiences and I think it taps the life experiences of all of us as well. We come from diverse backgrounds, but we all, whether in the public or private sector, realize that this point in history we are on the cutting edge in terms of what direction our society is going to take. The role of education and other institutions is critical. So I want to thank you all for your participation in this most important effort and tell you that you will be contacted again about future meetings on citizen education. I hope you will plan to join us and work with the task force in promoting citizen education in our state.

APPENDIX 6

CITIZEN EDUCATION PRIORITY IN THE STATE OF DELAWARE

STATE OF DELAWARE

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION
THE TOWNSEND BUILDING
P.O. BOX 1402
DOVER, DELAWARE 19901

KENNETH C. MADDEN
STATE SUPERINTENDENT

RANDALL L. BROYLES
HOWARD E. ROW
JOHN J. RYAN
ASSISTANT SUPERINTENDENTS

May 17, 1978

MAY 22 1978

B. Z. P.

Dr. Barbara Z. Presseisen
Director of Citizen Education
Development Division
Research for Better Schools, Inc.
1700 Market Street
Philadelphia, PA. 19103

Dear Barbara:

One of five priority needs that I presented to the division director for the 1978-1979 school year was in the area of citizen education. Following is the need statement and supporting data to justify the need:

Need statement:

There is a need to develop a K-12 model for citizen education curriculum for acquisition of knowledge, skills (e.g. inquiry and interpersonal action) and dispositions (e.g. respect, caring and commitment).

Data supporting need statement:

National Council for the Social Studies is making special efforts to improve citizen education instruction.

Council of Chief State School Officers has concluded that recognizing the need for a new level of citizen education may be the most important action the Council can take at this time.

American Bar Association has stated a renewed concern.

Poor results of NAEP citizenship test.

Lack of defined citizen education in Delaware schools.

The above need was integrated as one component of a proposed goal and objective prepared by the Division of Instruction. It reads as follows:

(Continued)

To improve the appropriateness of quality and quantity of data available to educational decision makers.

Objective	Enabling Objective
To foster the decision-making capabilities of district curriculum personnel.	By providing them with curriculum guides which give the recommended scope and sequence of both content and skill objectives in the following areas: energy, citizen education, art, health, music, physical education, and foreign language.

A composite listing of needs has further been synthesized by departmental staff into "Proposed Goals for the Department for 1978-79". They will be considered by the State Board at its meeting this week. The divisional goal is subsumed under two departmental goals related to:

1. Increased quality of information available to decision makers.

2. Increased student achievement.

Sincerely,

Don Knouse

Donald R. Knouse
State Supervisor of Social Studies

DRK/nt

CC: Dr. Donald H. H. Wachter